

bulletin



ADDRESS BY PRESIDENT EISENHOWER ON FOREIGN CURRENCY EXCHANGE AND INSPECTION

June 27, 1954 643

STATEMENT OF OUR FUTURE by Secretary Acheson

June 27, 1954 649

DECLARATION ON THE CULP OF COLD WAR by Secretary Acheson

June 27, 1954 657

THE IMPORTANCE OF TRADE BETWEEN AMERICAN COUNTRIES by Assistant Secretary Bellows

June 27, 1954 654

WASHINGTON OLD HALL, CENTER OF BRITISH-AMERICAN FRIENDSHIP by Ambassador Wadhvani

June 27, 1954 661

STATEMENT OF SECRETARY ACHESON ON FOREIGN CURRENCY EXCHANGE

June 27, 1954 669

STATEMENT OF SECRETARY ACHESON ON FOREIGN CURRENCY EXCHANGE

June 27, 1954 675

STATEMENT OF SECRETARY ACHESON ON FOREIGN CURRENCY EXCHANGE

June 27, 1954 681



The Department of State bulletin

VOL. XXXIII, No. 852 • PUBLICATION 6044

October 24, 1955

The Department of State BULLETIN, a weekly publication issued by the Public Services Division, provides the public and interested agencies of the Government with information on developments in the field of foreign relations and on the work of the Department of State and the Foreign Service. The BULLETIN includes selected press releases on foreign policy, issued by the White House and the Department, and statements and addresses made by the President and by the Secretary of State and other officers of the Department, as well as special articles on various phases of international affairs and the functions of the Department. Information is included concerning treaties and international agreements to which the United States is or may become a party and treaties of general international interest.

Publications of the Department, as well as legislative material in the field of international relations, are listed currently.

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents
U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington 25, D.C.

PRICE:
52 issues, domestic \$7.50, foreign \$10.25
Single copy, 20 cents

The printing of this publication has been approved by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget (January 19, 1955).

Note: Contents of this publication are not copyrighted and items contained herein may be reprinted. Citation of the DEPARTMENT OF STATE BULLETIN as the source will be appreciated.

"Confident of Our Future"

Address by Secretary Dulles¹

It is an honor and a privilege to speak at this opening of your convention. You are those who in time of national peril were ready to sacrifice life itself that our country and its principles might survive. And in time of peace, through your conventions and manifold committee and educational activities, you cultivate the spirit of patriotism.

Love of country is a great virtue. It is one on which free societies particularly depend. For, while despotisms can *command* sacrifices, free societies can only *ask* for sacrifice. And the response is measured by patriotism.

Of course, patriotism can be perverted into a fanatical and evil force. But in this country patriotism has, in the main, been enlightened and has seen that our own welfare was identified with that of others. Perhaps that is because our people have been God-fearing people who have respected the Biblical injunction that "Whatsoever ye would that men would do to you, do even so to them."

From our earliest days patriotism and religion have been linked. George Washington, in his Farewell Address, said, "In vain would that man claim the tribute of patriotism" who did not accept religion and morality as the supporting pillars of our free society.

Patriotism of that kind cannot be a purely selfish force. It seeks liberty for nations and dignity for man. It welcomes international cooperation toward these ends, and it has nothing to fear from such cooperation.

There should be no thought in any quarter that recent international events, such as the "summit" conference at Geneva, have lessened the need for patriotism and the discipline and sacrifice it enjoins.

After the end of World War II the institutions

of freedom were still subjected to heavy assaults. They not only stood up under these assaults, they grew under them. The latest fierce attack came last spring, when the Communists tried desperately to prevent the establishment of Western European unity.

After that effort failed, the Soviet rulers radically changed their demeanor. For 10 years intolerance had been the dominant theme. They treated as enemies all who would not follow the Communist line and accept Communist discipline as administered from Moscow.

Now all of that seems changed. Today it is Soviet policy to appear friendly and to mingle with all the world. Perhaps the Russians have a proverb like ours which says, "If you can't lick 'em, join 'em."

However, the Russians, as "joiners," create new problems—for us and also for them.

Within the Soviet bloc, people increasingly show that they expect for themselves some of the tolerance which they see so lavishly bestowed on others. Such pressures could gradually transform the Soviet area into a respected segment of the society of nations.

Outside the Soviet bloc, some doors which used to be closed are now open, or at least ajar. And this occurs before anyone can surely know the real purpose of the Soviet "new look."

Soviet Communist doctrine has persistently taught retreat and zigzag as a tactic of conquest. So we cannot tell whether what is now going on marks a genuine change of purpose or whether it is merely a maneuver. We have to have plans that fit either contingency. We must not rebuff a change which might be that for which the whole world longs. On the other hand, we must not expose ourselves to what could be mortal danger.

Never, perhaps, has national policy faced so dif-

¹Made before the American Legion at Miami, Fla., on Oct. 10 (press release 597).

ficult and delicate a task. Mere cleverness will not suffice. Our dependence must be on fundamentals. Fortunately we have basic assets, material and moral. These assets have no aggressive aspect, yet they exert a profound influence upon world affairs.

Let us briefly consider what these assets are.

Productivity

We have productivity. Our rate of productivity is the greatest in history, now estimated at nearly \$400 billion a year. The magnitude of that can be appreciated when it is noted that it is three times that of the Soviet Union with its much larger population.

More significant than quantity are the human satisfactions that accompany our production. It is the result of free choice. No governmental decrees force men and women into work that is repugnant to them. And because people do work that they like, they strive to excel and so become competitive and more productive.

It is also significant that what our people freely produce is not only huge in quantity, but it is widely distributed to bring rising standards of living.

Forced labor can, of course, be made to produce some conspicuous results. The world is dotted with the monuments of past despotisms, and some new ones are being built today. But admiration of such feats should not submerge pity for the human misery which they cost.

Our duty and opportunity is to offer the world the example of an economy which, as a matter of free choice, produces vastly and distributes fairly. That we do, and must continue to do, with constant striving for betterment.

Power

We have power. Out of productivity, a part is set aside to make sure that the treasure house of freedom will not be pillaged.

We do not like to divert human effort to non-productive purposes, and it requires a strong sense of duty to apply, as we are doing, more than a tenth of all we produce to national defense. Your Government is striving to bring about international conditions which might safely enable us to reduce this nonproductive diversion.

We do not, however, intend to be reckless in this respect.

We had to build hastily the military establishment we needed in World War I; and then we scrapped it.

Then, with the coming of World War II, we built up what became the world's greatest military establishment; and again we scrapped it.

Then, when the Korean war came, we had to build the third time.

This time we do not propose to disarm ourselves unless we can be sure that others are doing the same.

That is not because the American people have gone militaristic. The instinct of the American people is as strong as ever against maintaining military establishments. It is because we have learned the hard way. The Soviet Union itself, in Korea, helped to teach us that disarmament, if it may prove to be one-sided, does not produce peace.

We are eager to reduce military expenditure. But we remember George Washington's advice in his Farewell Address that, while public credit must be cherished, nevertheless "timely disbursements to prepare for danger frequently prevent much greater disbursements to repel it."

Terrorism has always been a tool of despotism. A preponderance of weapons in the hands of those without moral scruples is dangerous.

That is why, for our own sake and for the sake of all free men, we must retain the relative power needed to deter aggression.

Principles

We have principles. Our productivity and our power do not rattle haphazardly about the world. They are harnessed to basic moral principles.

There is a school of thought which claims that morality and foreign policy do not mix. That never has been, is not, and I pray never will be the American ideal.

Diplomacy which is divorced from morality also divorces the government from the people. Our people can understand, and will support, policies which can be explained and understood in moral terms. But policies merely based on carefully calculated expediency could never be explained and would never be understood.

Furthermore, a nation with our worldwide concerns needs to follow a course which other countries can feel is stable and predictable. This will be the case if our policies are based upon principle.

It will not be the case if our policies are based upon the shifting sands of expediency.

As an example of the principles to which we adhere, I cite the principle that military force should not be used aggressively to achieve national goals.

Power, particularly great power, is always dangerous unless it is subject to self-imposed restraints.

Recently we were gravely provoked by the Chinese Communists, who retained and imprisoned 15 of our fliers in violation of the Korean Armistice Agreement. We had the power to take prompt and overwhelming reprisals. We did not do so; neither did we bargain or pay ransom. We relied upon the United Nations to bring moral pressures into play. Now all 15 of our brave comrades are free and home.

We hope that the Chinese Communists will accept for themselves this "renunciation of force" principle. Until now they have largely lived by the sword. They came into power through violent revolution. They moved into Korea to fight the United Nations Command. They took Tibet by force. They allied themselves with force in Indochina. But perhaps they are now beginning to see that persistence in the use of force will surely bring disaster.

Another of the principles we apply is that productivity is not for purely selfish use. We do not seek to be an oasis of material prosperity in a desert of human misery.

During the last 10 years the Government has granted or loaned abroad approximately \$40 billion for economic purposes. The recipients have in the main been those allies which greatly suffered from the war or which with us face a common danger and build with us a common defense.

In the same period approximately \$12.5 billion of private funds have flowed abroad to develop countries which welcome and provide opportunity for foreign capital.

Thus we seek to use both our great economic productivity and our great military power in accordance with good principles.

Some other nations would, at times, prefer it if the United States would deviate from basic principles to help them meet their immediate problems. If we do not do so, they may temporarily turn away. But beneath such surface dissatisfactions lies, I feel, a sense of respect for the United

States because we at least try to live by principle. Certainly that is essential to our own sense of self-respect.

Partnership

We have partnership. Modern developments in the field of communications have drawn nations physically together so that, as never before, what concerns one concerns many. It was always wrong to operate on the basis of "each for himself and the devil take the hindmost." Now it is also stupid.

Within our nations people seek security on a collective basis. We have our community police force, our fire department, and other civic aids. Thus, by working together we get more security at less cost.

The time has come when the nations also need to get together on a community basis.

The ideal, of course, would be to have collective security on a universal basis. That is the design of the United Nations. But trust and confidence do not yet exist on a universal basis. So, many nations have created collective security organizations of their own, as permitted by the United Nations Charter.

The United States now has partnership association for security with 44 nations. The result is to create a measure of security which no one, not even the strongest, could achieve on a purely national basis.

The Soviet rulers profess to regard these developments as dangerous. They advocate—for others—what they call "neutrality." By this they mean that each nation should have the weakness which is inevitable when each depends on itself alone.

But the Soviet rulers practice, for themselves, something very different from what they thus preach to others. They have forged a vast domain. The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics is itself a multinational state consisting of 16 so-called republics, several of which were once independent nations.

Several other countries, in whole or part, are tied into the Soviet bloc by the hold of the Soviet Communist Party or the Red Army.

Also, there is close identity with Communist China, which in turn dominates all or part of several other nations.

Thus, the Soviet bloc represents an amalgama-

tion of about 900 million people, normally constituting more than 20 distinct national groups.

The United States does not believe in practicing neutrality. Barring exceptional cases, neutrality today is an obsolete conception. It is like asking each community to forego a police force and to leave it to each citizen to defend his own home with his own gun.

Equally, we do not believe that nations and peoples who want to be independent should be forced into unwelcome dominance by others merely to produce monolithic power. We do not believe that such artificial unity will last or produce genuine security.

We do believe that peoples who trust each other should freely draw together for their mutual security.

The United States is helping to bring into being that modern and forward-looking practice. Through it all who love liberty can more surely have liberty.

Peace

We have peace. Peace is the goal which we devoutly seek. But let us never forget that the peace we now have, and the peace which we would preserve, is not peace at any price. It is peace with freedom, purchased by those who were willing to fight and die.

Last winter, when aggression threatened in the Formosa area, the Congress unitedly authorized the President to use the armed forces of the United States for the defense of our vital interests and of our ally in that area.

I believe that this action contributed indispensably to the preservation of peace at that juncture.

Two years ago I addressed your convention in St. Louis.² Speaking of the "art of peace," I said: "If events are likely which will in fact lead us to fight, let us make clear our intention in advance; then we shall probably not have to fight." The bipartisan action of the Congress was a notable application of that doctrine.

Peace, at least the only kind of peace that is worth having, requires an intrepid spirit in defense of freedom and justice. Without that spirit, aggressors run rife until finally in desperation there is resistance and war.

But lest what I say should be misunderstood or

misrepresented in any quarter, in any way, for any reason, let me say what you all know: There is no nation in the world which is more utterly dedicated to peace than is our Nation.

One of the great gains of the "summit" conference at Geneva was that it gave President Eisenhower an opportunity to demonstrate, so that none could doubt, our Nation's devotion to peace. I refer particularly to his spontaneous offer to exchange military blueprints with the Soviet Union and allow them to overfly the United States on a basis of reciprocity. That was an offer which could only have come from the serenity of the peace-loving spirit of our beloved President. And the Nation wholly supported that proposal.

We hope that the Soviet rulers will accept it. If they do, in good spirit, then we can confidently move on to international measures to reduce and control the instruments of death.

President Eisenhower's latest offer is a sequel to other dramatic proposals made in pursuit of peace. In 1946 President Truman offered to internationalize our then monopoly of atomic energy. In December 1953 President Eisenhower made his "atoms for peace" proposal that fissionable material, then designed for war, should be put into a world bank and made to work for peace.

So the United States makes manifest its peaceful purposes.

But as President Eisenhower recently said,³ "We must not think of peace as a static condition in world affairs. . . . Unless there is peaceful change, there is bound to be violent change." And he cited as situations which needed to be changed the division of Germany and the subjection of the once-free nations of Eastern Europe.

There are some skeptics who doubt that change can be brought about peacefully. History does not justify this conclusion. The recent liberation of Austria came about primarily because world opinion insistently demanded it as a step which represented elemental justice. In the same way world opinion will act as a compulsion on the Soviet Union to relax its grip upon East Germany and to permit the unification of Germany.

Also, I believe that world opinion will compel the restoration of national independence to the captive states of Eastern Europe.

Independence must also come to those dependent

² BULLETIN of Sept. 14, 1953, p. 339.

³ *Ibid.*, Sept. 5, 1955, p. 376.

countries—those colonies—whose people desire independence and are capable of sustaining it.

And the less developed areas should be helped to provide a better livelihood for their peoples.

These changes will surely come to pass. The only question is when, and by whom.

We can, and indeed we must, look forward to an era of peaceful change. We do not seek other than peace, but also we do not seek a peace other than one which will be curative and creative.

Our Task Today

The United States has no desire and no mandate to run the world. Many things will go right without our help and many things will go wrong that we cannot help. We shall not always be able to save others from what we believe to be their mistakes, and we know that we shall at times commit what others believe to be our mistakes.

But one thing we can do. That is, be a nation which stands for what all men aspire.

That indeed has been the mission of our Nation since its foundation. Our founders said (*Federalist* Paper No. 1), "It seems to be reserved to the people of this country to show, by their conduct and example" that it is possible for men freely to establish good government; and that "failure on their part" would be "the general misfortune of mankind." Throughout the intervening years, our Nation has patriotically lived up to that ideal. That same mission is our task today.

If in freedom we produce bounteously; if we have defensive power to deter aggression; if we use our military and economic power in accordance with high moral principles; if we extend the hand of fellowship to all who in sincerity would grasp it; and if we seek a peace which will eradicate injustice, then we can be confident of our future. In that way, the patriotism of the living can pay tribute to the patriotism of the dead.

U.S. Establishes Mission to Coal and Steel Community

The Department of State announced on October 10 (press release 599) that, pursuant to direction of the President on September 23, 1955, a U.S. mission to the European Coal and Steel Community (Schuman Plan) in Luxembourg will be established. This action reflects the importance

which the U.S. Government attaches to the European Coal and Steel Community.

W. Walton Butterworth has been appointed as head of this mission to serve as U.S. Representative to the Ecsc and will have the personal rank of Ambassador. His most recent assignment has been as Minister and Deputy Chief of Mission at the American Embassy, London.

President and Soviet Premier Exchange Views on Inspection

Following are texts of letters exchanged by President Eisenhower and Nikolai A. Bulganin, Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, on the subject of the President's July 21 proposal concerning exchange of military information and aerial inspection.

PRESIDENT EISENHOWER TO MR. BULGANIN

White House press release dated October 12

DENVER, COLORADO

October 11, 1955

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I wish to thank you for your letter of September 19, 1955 about my Geneva proposal of July 21 that we exchange information about military establishments and permit reciprocal aerial inspection over our two countries.

You raise a good many questions, and I shall not be able to reply to them until the doctors let me do more than at present. In any event, a full reply calls for preliminary work by my advisers and this is actively under way.

Let me now say, however, that I am encouraged that you are giving such full consideration to my Geneva proposal. I hope that we can agree on it, not as a cure-all, but, as I said at Geneva, to show a spirit of non-aggressiveness on both sides and so to create a fresh atmosphere which would dispel much of the present fear and suspicion. This, of itself, would be worthwhile. It would, I believe, make it more possible to make progress in terms of comprehensive plans for inspection, controls and reductions of armament, which will satisfy the high hopes of our peoples, and indeed of all the world.

I have not forgotten your proposal having to do with stationing inspection teams at key points in our countries, and if you feel this would help to create the better spirit I refer to, we could accept that too.

With best wishes,
Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER

MR. BULGANIN TO PRESIDENT EISENHOWER

SEPTEMBER 19, 1955

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I feel I must sincerely and frankly exchange opinions with you on a subject which at the present time has acquired particular importance. I have in mind the question which is being discussed now by our representatives in the subcommittee of the U.N. Disarmament Commission.

In the course of our memorable meetings in Geneva we agreed to work jointly for elaboration of an acceptable system of disarmament. When we approved directives to our Ministers of Foreign Affairs on this score, I thought a great deal had been accomplished. Now the representatives of our countries, guided by these directives and taking into account in their work the opinions and proposals put forth by the heads of the four governments in Geneva, can and must achieve definite progress.

I and my colleagues thought that even at the very beginning of their work our representatives would be able to reach general agreement on those basic questions on which our viewpoints either coincided or had already appreciably approached each other. I have in mind first of all the question of the levels of armed forces of the five great powers, the question of dates for introducing into force the prohibition of atomic weapons, and the question of international control. In this manner there would be created a solid foundation for further work during which it would be possible to make more precise all the details of the necessary agreements concerning the working out of an acceptable system of disarmament.

However, the first weeks of the work of the subcommittee so far have not yet produced those results for which you and I were fully entitled to hope, and I must frankly say that the delay is occasioned to a considerable degree by the fact that the members of the subcommittee so far do not

know the position of the representative of the United States with regard to those provisions which we had all the grounds to consider as agreed. As is known, the representative of the United States completely put aside the questions of reduction of the armed forces, of armaments, and prohibition of atomic weapons, having expressed the desire to discuss first of all and mainly your proposal concerning the exchange of military information between the U.S.S.R. and the U.S.A. as well as of the mutual exchange of aerial photography of the territories of both countries.¹ In this manner the impression is left that the entire problem of disarmament is being confined by him to these proposals.

I think to put the question in this manner would not satisfy the aspiration of peoples, even though I fully recognize the importance of the proposals introduced by you in Geneva.

However, since I and my colleagues have received the above-mentioned impression, I consider it my duty once more to share with you, esteemed Mr. President, certain primary considerations.

We feel that the main problem for us is to use further efforts to look for ways which would permit us to move the problem of disarmament away from dead center, which problem has vital importance for the peoples of the U.S.S.R. and the U.S.A. as well as peoples of the entire world.

In connection with this allow me to touch upon the proposals put forward by you at Geneva. We regard these proposals as testimony of your sincere desire to find a way to settle the important problem of the international control and inspection and to contribute personally to general efforts for the normalization of international relations.

Upon our return from Geneva we with all carefulness have studied your proposal of July 21² which was introduced on August 30 by Mr. Stassen into the disarmament subcommittee. In the course of this study several questions have arisen about which I would like to express to you my thoughts.

First of all, about the mutual exchange by the United States of America and the Soviet Union of information concerning their armed forces and armaments.

In principle, we have no objections to this pro-

¹ For text of the opening statement made by Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., in the subcommittee on Aug. 29, see BULLETIN of Sept. 12, 1955, p. 438.

² *Ibid.*, Aug. 1, 1955, p. 173.

posal. I think that at a definite stage the exchange of such information between states is necessary. It would be better, however, if such information concerning armaments were submitted by all states, and not only by the U.S. and the U.S.S.R., to the international organ of control and inspection, concerning the creation of which we should reach an agreement. In order to avoid misunderstandings, it is self-evident that information on all kinds of armaments, conventional as well as nuclear, must be submitted in order to avoid misunderstanding. If these considerations are valid, we should carefully discuss exactly when this full information on armaments of states should be presented and first of all information concerning the armaments of great powers.

It is self-evident that the submission of the above-mentioned information to an international control organ would become significant only if agreement is achieved on the reduction of armaments and on taking measures for the prohibition of atomic weapons.

It seems to me that the problem of the creation of an international control organ which would satisfy the requirements of the problems of disarmament should be considered in indissoluble unity with decisions for putting into effect a plan for gradual disarmament. At the same time it is necessary to keep sight of the fact that achievement of a really valuable exchange of military information will become really effective to the degree that mutual trust among states is strengthened.

Now I would also like to express my opinion about the problem of aerial photography.

I do not doubt that when you introduced your proposal for photographing from the air the territories of our two countries, you were guided by a legitimate desire to create confidence that neither of our two countries would be subjected to attack by the other.

However, let us be frank to the end. Under present international conditions both our countries are not acting singly. The United States of America, as is known, heads all military groupings which exist in the West and in the East, and what is more their armed forces are stationed not only on American territory; they are also stationed in England, West Germany, Italy, France, Spain, North Africa, Greece, Turkey, in several countries of the Near and Middle East, in Japan, on Taiwan, in the Philippines, etc.

To this should be added the fact that the armed forces of several states are organically connected with the military forces of the United States through inclusion under a single command.

Under these conditions, the Soviet Union on its side has united militarily with several allied states.

It is impossible not to see that the proposal introduced by you completely omits from consideration armed forces and military installations which are outside the area of the United States and the Soviet Union.

And yet it is perfectly self-evident that aerial photographing should also be extended to all armed forces and military installations located on the territories of those other states.

This presents an entirely new problem: Would the governments of such states permit their sovereign territory to be photographed from the air by foreign aircraft?

All this shows that the problem of aerial photography is not a question which, under present conditions, would lead to effective progress toward insuring security of states and successful accomplishment of disarmament.

This conclusion is suggested by the fact that your proposal, unfortunately, does not mention the necessity for reduction of armaments and prohibition of atomic weapons.

It is therefore natural that people should ask more and more often what the proposal for aerial photography and the collecting of such information would really do to end the arms race. If such a proposal does not promote the ending of the arms race, then it means that it does not remove the threat of a new war. It does not lighten the burden which the peoples are bearing in connection with this arms race. Would such a proposal satisfy the expectations of the people of our states and those of all countries?

Finally, it is impossible not to stop and think about what would happen if we occupy ourselves with the questions of aerial photography and the exchange of military information without taking effective measures for reduction of armaments and prohibition of atomic weapons.

I have apprehensions which I cannot help but share with you. Would not such a situation lead to the weakening of vigilance toward the still existing threat of violation of the peace generated by the arms race?

My remarks do not at all mean that we cannot achieve an agreement on important aspects of the

disarmament problem. I would like to call your attention to the fact that on very substantial aspects of this problem our positions have become so close that we would be able to reach a definite agreement.

Let us take such a question as the establishment of levels of armed forces for the great powers.

It is generally recognized that this is a question of great importance. Originally, the idea of establishing levels to which armed forces of the Big Five should be reduced, as is known, was put forth by your Government together with the Governments of Great Britain and France in 1952.³ In the interest of achieving general agreement on this matter, which is so important for the problem of disarmament, we decided to adopt this joint proposal of the U.S., England, and France as a basis for discussion. Consequently we have a common point of view on this question. It is very important for us to arrive at agreement on this point.

On the question of atomic weapons, we must remember that at the present, when the greatest armies of the world have at their disposal such means of mass destruction as atomic and hydrogen weapons, it is impossible, of course, to talk about disarmament without touching on this important subject. Therefore, we have always attached paramount importance to the problem of prohibition of atomic weapons. In the discussion of this problem, one of the substantial subjects of disagreement was the question of dates when the prohibition against the use of atomic weapons would go into force. In our desire to bring the opposition positions closer and to thereby facilitate and expedite the achievement of agreement on this subject, we agreed to accept the dates for putting into force the prohibition on the use of atomic weapons which were proposed by the representatives of England and France in the subcommittee of the U.N. Commission on Disarmament in London in April 1955.⁴

I think you will agree that the proposal concerning the stage at which prohibition against the use of atomic weapons would come into force, as proposed by England and France, and accepted by the Soviet Union, satisfies our common interests.

It would be desirable—and I think completely

feasible—to reach an agreement also on this question.

It also seems expedient for us to reach agreement at this time on putting into effect several measures designed to prevent sudden attack by one state or another. We feel that this measure would be in accord with the interests of maintaining peace and security of nations and in this respect it would be possible to reach agreement also concerning the form of control suitable to the above-mentioned problem.

You, Mr. President, as a military man, know from your own experience that modern war requires drawing into military action armies of many millions and an enormous quantity of technical combat equipment. In this connection great importance has now been acquired by the definite locations where concentrations of large military groups can take place and whose armaments would include all this technical combat equipment. The system of control proposed by us, namely the creation of control posts in large ports, at railroad junctions, on automobile highways, and at airfields, is designed to prevent dangerous concentrations of troops and combat equipment on large scale and thereby remove the possibility of sudden attack by one country against another. Establishment of such posts would be an important step toward relaxation of international tension and the establishment of trust among states.

In my opinion our proposal concerning control posts has the advantage that it provides a definite guaranty against a sudden attack by one state against another.

I think you will agree that the proposals introduced by us concerning levels of armed forces, the dates for coming into effect of the prohibition of nuclear weapons and for the establishment of control posts can promote the reduction of tension in international relations and strengthening of peace. I do not see, therefore, any reasons why we could not arrange to reach agreement on these questions. Such joint decisions of the Four Powers would have tremendous importance because they would put into the hearts of millions of people the assurance that disarmament is fully realizable and that real steps are being taken in this direction. An agreement on these questions would open the way toward solution of other questions which concern the problem of disarmament. It would encourage the strengthening of that atmosphere of coopera-

³ *Ibid.*, June 9, 1952, p. 910.

⁴ *Ibid.*, May 30, 1955, p. 897.

tion and mutual understanding which we initiated at Geneva, and it would create favorable conditions to put into practice a broader program of disarmament and control over this disarmament.

In presenting ideas to you, Mr. President, I am inspired by the sincere desire to achieve through a frank exchange of opinions on the problem of disarmament better mutual understanding which may facilitate reaching agreed decisions on this most important problem.

Inasmuch as the solution of these questions depends mainly on the four great powers who participated in the Geneva Conference, I have taken the liberty of sending copies of this letter to Mr. Eden and Mr. Faure and hope that you will not misunderstand this action.

I hope soon to receive your ideas on the questions touched upon in this letter.

With sincere respect,

N. BULGANIN

Progress in the Rule of Law

by Herman Phleger
*Legal Adviser*¹

Being lawyers, I thought it might be of interest to review with you today the developments of this century that might loosely be called progress in the rule of law in the international field.

One of the paradoxes of our time is that, while the overwhelming majority of mankind abhors war, it has not been possible as yet to achieve a just and lasting peace. The prospect, in this atomic age, that the next war might result in annihilating mankind points to the urgency of finding a solution for this problem.

While undue optimism is to be avoided, and the failures are fresh in our memory, it is worthy of note that significant progress has been made in the past 60 years in the concept of collective security and the renunciation of aggressive war. We should not permit the failures to obscure the successes, for, if we are to build a system of collective security that will be effective in the future, it must be upon the foundations that have been laid since the beginning of this century.

Indeed, if we compare the situation today with that of a scant 50 years ago, the progress has been significant.

Fifty years ago war was accepted as a perfectly legitimate instrument of national policy. Learned writers in the field of international law asserted

its legality. Collective efforts were largely confined to ameliorating the harsh conditions of war—agreeing on the rules of the game, so to speak. The Hague Conventions on land and naval warfare, the Red Cross Convention, and the later Geneva Conventions regulating the treatment of prisoners of war represented efforts of the world community to make war endurable, since its abolition seemed impossible.

The great Hague Peace Conference of 1899, called to consider means of preserving the peace, drafted a Convention for the Pacific Settlement of Disputes providing for a Permanent Court of Arbitration. But it also had as one of its principal accomplishments the formulation of the Laws and Customs of Land Warfare.

The Second Hague Conference of 1907 formulated conventions on naval warfare and the rights and duties of neutrals. A precarious peace, based on a constant shifting of the balance of power, was maintained on a razor-edge equilibrium.

Conciliation and Arbitration Treaties

Voluntary arbitration, conciliation, and mediation were looked to to supplement traditional diplomacy in the solution of international disputes. The United States was most active in this field. In 1908-9 Secretary Root concluded arbitration treaties with six countries. In 1913 and 1914, 19

¹ Address made before the Philadelphia Bar Association on Oct. 10 (press release 596 dated Oct. 8).

treaties, known as the Bryan Peace Treaties, were entered into by the United States. These bound the parties to mediation and conciliation before resorting to hostilities to settle differences.

The League of Nations

The First World War, drawing into its vortex most of the world powers, demonstrated the ineffectiveness of these measures and pointed to the imperative need for some system of collective security if peace was to be maintained. The Covenant of the League of Nations, joined in by 63 nations, represented a collective attempt to meet this need.

As we all know, the Covenant did not secure the approval of the United States Senate, and the United States did not become a party. Whether or how much this decision contributed to the failure of the League has been the subject of many a lively debate.

Further Efforts To Insure Peace

But though the United States did not join the League, it was not idle in its efforts to further world peace. In 1922 it called the Washington Conference, where the five principal naval powers agreed to a limitation of their naval forces. At the same conference the Nine Power Treaty, designed to assure the integrity of China, was entered into.

During the years 1926 through 1931, no fewer than 26 arbitration and 18 conciliation treaties, commonly called the Kellogg Treaties, were entered into by the United States.

In 1925 Germany, Great Britain, France, Italy, and Belgium signed the Locarno Treaty, designed to prevent a repetition of World War I. In it, the parties agreed to refrain from war and bound themselves to come to the aid of any party attacked by any other party.

Then in 1928 came the Kellogg-Briand Pact. In this treaty the signatories solemnly bound themselves to renounce war as an instrument of national policy. Sixty-three nations became parties to this pact. One of the first was the Soviet Union. It is interesting to note that this treaty, despite the intervention of World War II, remains in force today as to all its signatories, there having been no denunciation or withdrawal by any party.

From the standpoint of international law, this treaty was a revolutionary development. Taken

at face value, it was an agreement between the members of the world community that it would be a breach of solemn treaty obligations to engage in aggressive war.

Yet 10 years later Germany invaded Poland and World War II was under way.

In connection with the Kellogg-Briand Pact, I cannot refrain from quoting from Senator [George Wharton] Pepper's admirable autobiography. He wrote, speaking of the spring of 1928,

During our brief sojourn in Paris, the Kellogg-Briand Pact was signed at the French Foreign Office in an atmosphere of optimism. Mrs. Pepper and I were guests at the Embassy at a brilliant dinner given by Ambassador Herrick to Secretary Kellogg. My incurable lack of faith in international promises made me less enthusiastic than the rest of the company. They felt, or pretended to feel, that war had at last received its death warrant.

The United Nations

A hope that sustained those who bore the burdens of World War II was that out of it would come a world order that would make its repetition impossible. A system of collective security was envisaged that would rule out aggressive warfare for all time.

The United Nations Charter, signed in 1945, was in fulfillment of this hope. Sixty states are now members. The charter requires its members to "settle their international disputes by peaceful means" and to "refrain . . . from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state."

Action to implement these undertakings is entrusted to the Security Council, where, as you know, it is subject to veto by any one of the five permanent members. Vetoes by Soviet Russia have been frequent.

The only collective military action taken by members to stop an outright breach of international peace was that taken pursuant to the resolution of the Security Council in 1950, calling upon the members to repel the aggression of North Korea against South Korea. That action was possible because the Soviet representative, Gromyko, had "taken a walk" and was not present when the vote was taken, it being held that a voluntary abstention by a permanent member did not have the effect of a veto.

Sixteen member nations responded to this call—the first instance of joint military action in dis-

charge of a prior commitment to act collectively to maintain world peace. Later, when the Chinese Communists swarmed across the Yalu, the General Assembly of the United Nations branded this as an aggression and called upon its members to embargo strategic materials.

Uniting for Peace

As a result of the Korean experience, the General Assembly decided to improve its procedures so as to take account of any future situation where the Security Council might be paralyzed by the veto. This was done by passage of the Uniting for Peace Resolution in the fall of 1950. This resolution permits United Nations action which would otherwise be impossible because of the veto in the Security Council.

The basis for this resolution was explained by Secretary Dulles in the course of debate over its adoption, as follows:²

... The same instrument which placed on the Security Council the "primary" responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security ... gave the General Assembly power to recommend even as to matters that might be vetoed. ...

... At San Francisco, the so-called "Little 45" had stoutly opposed the "veto power" demanded by the so-called "Big Five." Finally, in the closing days of the Conference, they agreed to accept the veto in the Security Council if Assembly powers were such that, if the Security Council were prevented from discharging its primary responsibility, the General Assembly could step in and discuss and recommend regarding such subjects as pacific settlement of disputes, breaches of the peace, the establishment of military contingents, etc. To insure that, they proposed to amend what is now article 10 by broadening the Assembly's right to recommend so that it could recommend as to "any matters within the scope of the present Charter."

The Soviet delegation at first declined to accept a broadening of article 10 which would prevent a veto in the Security Council from having finality. There was a resultant deadlock, while the day officially set for signing drew near. Finally, on June 19, 1945, the United States Ambassador at Moscow advised the Soviet Foreign Office that the United States felt it could not wait longer and would proceed with other nations. The next day the chairman of the Soviet delegation informed our Secretary of State that his Government, too, accepted the proposed broadening of article 10. With that last obstacle cleared away, the Charter was signed June 26.

The powers of the General Assembly we now invoke were won that day in San Francisco. There is no occasion now to put them in question. Rather, now is the time to use the rights then so hard won. That is the proposal before you.

² BULLETIN of Oct. 23, 1950, p. 651.

As you know, the Assembly adopted the Uniting for Peace Resolution, and shortly thereafter it met the challenge of a Soviet veto in the Korean situation by exercising its powers of recommendation. Thus the existence of the veto in the Security Council has not prevented the United Nations from acting as an instrument of collective security.

Right of Self-Defense

Another crucial development at San Francisco made it clear that the charter does not have the effect of impairing the sovereign right of self-defense. I refer to the foresight of Senator Vandenberg, strongly backed by the American States, in securing the insertion in the charter of article 51. This provides that

Nothing in the ... Charter shall impair the inherent right of individual or collective self-defense if an armed attack occurs. ...

U.S. Mutual Defense Treaties

This recognition that a commitment to refrain from the use of force is subject to the reservation that force may be used in self-defense is an essential basis for the security treaties which the United States has made since World War II and the signing of the charter. The other essential basis is continuing recognition of the responsibility of the United Nations for the maintenance of international peace and security.

These treaties have not only the object of protecting United States security by combining the strength of free nations to resist armed aggression, but to make that aggression less likely by giving advance notice of the interests of the United States and its determination to protect those interests. Miscalculations as to the intentions of the United States no doubt contributed to the launching of both World Wars. No longer will a prospective aggressor be likely to make a similar miscalculation. The Monroe Doctrine is the outstanding example of a successful United States policy based on a clear declaration of United States interests and intentions.

These treaties are made within the framework of the United Nations Charter and serve to strengthen it. They bind the parties to them to settle international disputes by peaceful means and to refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force in any way inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations. All

measures taken under the treaties are to be reported at once to the Security Council and are to be terminated when the Security Council has taken the necessary action.

I do not believe it is generally recognized how extensive, both as to parties and territories, these treaties are.

First, in 1947 there was the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance between the 21 American States. This treaty for the self-defense of the Western Hemisphere made the Monroe Doctrine mutual, where before it had been a unilateral policy of the United States. In this treaty it was agreed that an armed attack against an American State "shall be considered as an attack against all the American States," and each one agreed to assist in meeting the attack.

Two years later, in 1949, the North Atlantic Treaty was signed, designed to secure the North Atlantic community against the Communist threat. Its 15 parties agree that an armed attack against one or more in Europe or North America shall be considered an attack against them all. Earlier this year the Federal Republic of Germany, on regaining its sovereignty, acceded to this treaty.

Then came the series of treaties in the Pacific designed to provide mutual security for the free nations in that area.

First was the treaty with the Philippines in August 1951, followed soon after by the ANZUS Treaty with Australia and New Zealand. In these, each of the parties recognizes that an armed attack against a treaty member would be dangerous to its own peace and safety and declares that it will act to meet the common danger in accordance with its constitutional processes.

When the Japanese Peace Treaty was signed in 1951, the United States and Japan agreed by treaty on measures for the security of that area of the Pacific.

In October 1953, following the Korean Armistice, the United States and Korea entered into a mutual defense treaty.

In 1954, following the Geneva conference on Korean unification and Indochina, and after the aggressive intentions of the Communist movement in Southeast Asia were recognized as a menace to all the free nations having interests in that area, the Manila Pact was signed. In it, eight nations, including the Asian nations of Pakistan, Thailand, and the Philippines, recognized that armed attack

against any of the parties would endanger the peace and safety of all the others. In the case of the United States, the armed attack was identified in the treaty as Communist aggression.

In December of 1954 the United States signed a mutual defense treaty with the Republic of China.

These treaties constitute a system for the mutual defense of the free world against armed aggression and particularly Communist aggression, without precedent in history. The beneficial effect of the North Atlantic Treaty has already been demonstrated. The stabilizing effect of the others is already evident. They constitute a solid backing of the United Nations Charter.³

Peace by Agreement

When asked what I would talk about today, I suggested "Peace by Agreement." That is the description I would apply to the entire complex of bilateral and multilateral treaties by which the world community has tried to move forward by agreeing that aggressive warfare is no longer legal under international law. It is a lawyer's approach.

We have seen how the Covenant of the League and the solemn assurances of the Kellogg-Briand Pact were disregarded in World War II. We have witnessed the action of the United Nations in applying sanctions against aggression in Korea. We have witnessed the attempts of like-minded nations to insure the peace by mutual security treaties within the framework of the United Nations Charter.

The charter of the United Nations furnishes the broadest and most comprehensive juridical basis for maintaining the peace and for collective security that the world has ever seen. The system of mutual security treaties to which the United States is a party reaffirms the principles of the charter and reinforces its provisions outlawing aggressive war.

The Sanction of World Opinion

We would be naive to think that peace can be assured by words of agreement. Behind those words there must be good faith, and resolution, and dedication to the cause of peace. It behooves us all to add our moral and material support to these efforts to preserve the peace.

International law has been described as law

³ For a map illustrating these security arrangements, see *ibid.*, Mar. 21, 1955, p. 478.

without a constitution. In the absence of effective juridical sanctions, world opinion—aptly described in the Declaration of Independence as “a decent respect to the opinions of mankind”—

remains the most effective means of preventing aggressive war. In the formation of this opinion, we as lawyers, dedicated to the rule of law, bear a heavy responsibility.

Washington Old Hall, Symbol of British-American Kinship

by Winthrop W. Aldrich
*Ambassador to Great Britain*¹

The ground on which we stand today has a unique place in the history of the English-speaking peoples. It marks the origin of the family name of Washington—a name which George Washington, the first President of the United States, centuries later was to make so illustrious.

As you know, William de Hertburne around the year 1180 acquired this village and in accordance with the custom of the day obtained the right to the place-name as a family name. Either he or his son—the records are not clear on this point—therefore adopted the title William de Wessington, and his spelling in time became “Washington.”

George Washington's earliest traceable ancestors were lords of this manor and lived in this very house for 2 centuries during the Middle Ages; other branches of the family lived here for 450 years. When we consider that part of the original house built by William is here before our eyes today, we must conclude that, if the Washingtons were remarkable for nothing else, they would be remarkable for their ability to confer an apparent immortality on their homes. They did not confine this gift of building for the ages just to their homes. Another distinguished member of the family, John Washington, who was Prior of the Cathedral Church of Durham from 1416 to 1446, is recorded as having been the most prodigious builder, repairer, and restorer the Cathedral ever had. The cloisters which he built are still there and, since they have the Washington touch, I do not doubt that they will stand forever. We have

only to think of Sulgrave Manor, Mount Vernon, and many other ancestral homes of the Washingtons to be reminded again of the permanence of their mark.

The mark of the Washingtons survives in another striking way which is little known even in America. The family coat of arms is impressed on a leaden seal attached to a deed of sale dated 1376 which may be seen today in the library of Durham Cathedral. The Washington arms were carved on nearby Hylton Castle as early as 1250, when a member of the family married a Hylton. The carving is still there, showing a shield with three stars and two stripes, surmounted by an eagle with lifted wings. Who can resist the conjecture that here at Washington Old Hall is the true origin of the Stars and Stripes and the Great Seal of the United States Government?

Perhaps it is only coincidence that the family home of Martha Washington in Virginia was known as the “White House”—the identical name which was subsequently chosen for the official residence of our Presidents—but it is surely more than coincidence that the Washington arms combined the stars and stripes and the eagle, 2½ centuries before America was even discovered and 5 centuries before it became a nation.

As a patriotic monument, this first house of the first Washington has unrivaled significance and importance for present and future generations of Americans. It is surely fitting that the flag which was seen by the dawn's early light should now float proudly over this historic building. Indeed, the people of this ancient village of Washington have already established a precedent. For years they have appropriately dis-

¹ Address made at ceremonies marking the restoration of Washington Old Hall at Washington, County of Durham, on Sept. 28.

played the Stars and Stripes and the Union Jack side by side in the local school.

I say that this is fitting because the people of this country and the people of America have never parted company in certain fundamental respects, and there appears to be no likelihood that we ever will. Despite our political separation, we are still a community of like-minded peoples. We have the same love of liberty, respect for human rights, and belief in a law of common justice. Both for ourselves and others, we believe in a government deriving its power from the consent of the governed and free of unwarranted external interference. In the principles inspiring the conduct of our domestic and foreign affairs, we are deeply akin, and in seeking the peace, freedom, and prosperity of the world, we are closely allied.

It is natural that British and Americans should have joined hands in preserving Washington Old Hall from destruction and in giving it a new lease on life. Both England and colonial America played a part in shaping the character and achievements of George Washington, and the people of both our countries are his heirs. In him we see clearly this blending that makes us kin.

George Washington was a fourth-generation American (counting his great-grandfather John, who arrived in 1657) and the third generation to be born in America. Though George's grandfather and his father came to England for schooling, George himself did not. His formal schooling ended when he was 16, and his real education was obtained chiefly outdoors from practical men, learning how to grow tobacco, raise stock, and run plantations. He taught himself a good deal of mathematics and at 14 was already an able surveyor. He became a surveyor for a number of his youthful years, and the work took him far and wide into still undeveloped regions. He gained from this travel a knowledge of the richness of that new continent and the desire, which never diminished, to see it opened up, populated, and made fruitful. In working as a surveyor for Lord Fairfax, who came to America to benefit from his vast landholdings in Virginia, George Washington profited from the contact with that cultivated man of fine manners and taste. But George himself was not just a transplanted Englishman, though his English heritage ran strongly in him. He was something new—a blend—a new combination. He was a colonial American responding to the vital influence of a vast new land

which inevitably shaped the people who struggled to master it.

In common with most of the leading men of colonial America, George Washington identified himself and his country with the English Crown and had argument only against what he considered the harsh and unjust actions of the King and his ministers. He was reluctant to accept the step of political separation, and only did so when convinced that the destiny of America and its people required separation. His greatness then appeared. His character, poise, courage, and solid judgment pulled together all dissident elements and formed the rallying point for the shaping of a new nation.

He saw clearly the imperative need of a strong union of the Thirteen Colonies and by the sheer force of his convictions carried with him the convention that was framing the Constitution of the United States. In reply to those who advocated a weak instrument, he said, "Let us raise a standard to which the wise and honest can repair; the event is in the hands of God." The standard *was* raised, and he was unanimously elected the first President to hold it aloft. He held it high and strengthened its position, never ceasing to advocate a more perfect union and himself helping to give it lasting substance.

I said a moment ago that we are all the heirs of George Washington. We are, in too many ways to describe, but we are particularly his heirs as people who cherish freedom. In the North Atlantic community, we too have raised a standard to which the wise and honest can repair for the preservation of the peace and freedom of the entire world.

Washington Old Hall, therefore, will be more than a community center for the people of this village and a memorial to the great man whose lifeline traces back to this English soil. It will be a living symbol of the continuing unity of character and purpose of the English-speaking peoples.

We owe a debt of gratitude to those who have preserved this historic building.

In the year 1613, just 44 years before John Washington and his brother Augustine emigrated to America, Washington Old Hall passed back into the possession of the Bishop of Durham. The Bishop pulled down part of the house to build a new one of the original materials but left much of the original structure intact. After passing

subsequently through many hands, the house was converted in 1896 into tenement dwellings. By 1934 it had deteriorated so badly that it was condemned and ordered to be demolished. But though the honored association of this ancient house with the Washington family had been forgotten by everyone else, it had not been forgotten by the people of this village.

The village schoolmaster, Fred Hill, led a movement to preserve this historic building, and Washingtonians of Durham County gave enough money to buy the house, though the cost of restoring it was beyond local resources. In 1936, the Viscount Gort, Deputy Lieutenant of the County, organized a restoration committee and got some of the restoration accomplished. I can only marvel at the Viscount Gort's determination. World War II halted the project for many years but left the enthusiasm of Lord Gort and his committee undiminished. Several years ago, on a trip to America, Lord Gort enlisted the interest and support of the American and British Commonwealth Association, whose chairman, Charles Sumner Bird, is with us today. Additional contributing patrons were then obtained on both sides of the Atlantic, with the result that we see here now.

It has not yet been determined whether Washington Old Hall should be put into the hands of the National Trust or under the Sulgrave Manor Trustees, but with either arrangement the future of the building will be assured.

What that future holds is symbolized by the fact that we have in our midst at this very moment Colonel Webster, representing the Governor of New York State, with a contingent of the Washington Greys—the original bodyguard of General George Washington—who made the trip over from America for this occasion.

Their presence here occasions no alarm. On the contrary, it reminds us—as does that of the American troops stationed in Britain—that this nation and mine are joined indissolubly together with other free nations in the determination to preserve our way of life, a purpose which derives its greatest strength from the friendship and alliance of the British and American peoples.

We could find no more perfect meeting place to rededicate ourselves to a future of freedom and friendship than this first home of the first Washington.

Visit of Foreign Minister of Portugal

Press release 598 dated October 10

The Foreign Minister of Portugal, Dr. Paulo Cunha, has accepted the invitation of the Secretary of State to make an official visit to Washington from November 30 through December 2.

During these 3 days the Foreign Minister will exchange views with the Secretary of State and other United States officials on current aspects of American-Portuguese relations and matters of mutual interest to both countries.

U.S. Welcomes Iran's Adherence to "Northern Tier" Pact

Press release 605 dated October 12

The United States welcomes the decision of Iran to adhere to the Pact of Mutual Cooperation signed at Baghdad by Iraq and Turkey on February 24, 1955, and subsequently adhered to by Pakistan and also by the United Kingdom.

Iran's decision to adhere to the Baghdad Pact is further evidence of the desire and ability of nations of the Middle East to develop regional arrangements for collective self-defense within the framework of the charter of the United Nations.

The drawing together of the "northern tier" nations of the Middle East is a normal development which should promote peace, stability, and well-being in the area. In no respect can this natural association be deemed hostile or threatening or directed against any other nation.

The United States has had a longstanding interest in the territorial integrity and sovereign independence of Iran. That has been amply demonstrated in the past. That interest remains a cardinal feature of U.S. policy and assures that the United States will not waver in its demonstrated purpose to assist Iran and other free nations which are making their own determined efforts to achieve defensive strength and economic and social progress.

The Importance of Trade in Inter-American Relations

by Henry F. Holland

*Assistant Secretary for Inter-American Affairs*¹

In the world today there are a number of broad basic developments which command our attention and which will affect the future of mankind.

In Europe millions of people have largely repaired the destruction of the last war. In Asia and Africa countless millions of people are committed to the arduous work of laying the foundations for stable governments and national economies.

Those nations in the bondage of international communism are demonstrating the futility of an economic and political system which after more than 35 years of testing still cannot function without slave labor and a disregard for the freedom and lives of millions of people.

In many ways the brightest and most hopeful area of the world today is Latin America. The strength and resources of its nations have not been wasted by war. The progress they have achieved in the past is largely intact to support further advancement. They are free to devote their national energies overwhelmingly to building the future. Our joint defense system rests largely on the forces of the United States and relieves the other American Republics of the burden of maintaining large independent military establishments. The early disheartening stages through which much of Asia and Africa is passing and where each measure of progress requires vast effort lie far behind Latin America. Millions of their men and women have acquired advanced technical, scientific, and professional skills. Innumerable industrial establishments exist. No country is without means of communication, and, in some, extensively developed systems exist. Do-

mestic and international trade reflect generations of experience.

But the most notable feature of this vast area, and perhaps one of the most exciting developments of our time, is the fact that its 174 millions of people are seized with a burning determination to surpass their previous achievements. They are eager to progress with giant strides toward the modern and stable economies they know can be achieved with the human and natural resources available to them. Our relations with this area will be profoundly affected by the extent to which its governments and peoples are convinced that the attainment of this objective can be facilitated by close cooperation with the United States.

They recognize, of course, as we do, that the overwhelming burden of performance in achieving their objectives, just as the credit for achievement, lies with the governments and peoples of Latin America. There are many ways, however, in which we can complement what they are doing and at the same time advance our own proper interests.

Our Government can give its greatest help to Latin American economic development by supporting policies which are directed toward the expansion of inter-American trade. Fortunately, that benefits us as well. Whether we like it or not, we must recognize that the economic and political stability of a number of our sister republics depends upon their continued access to United States markets for the goods they traditionally export to us. The industries that produce these products are usually among the strongest in the country. They represent the livelihood of tens of thousands of people. They produce a substantial part, at times the majority, of the government's tax income.

¹ Address made before the National Coffee Association at San Francisco, Calif., on Oct. 10 (press release 593 dated Oct. 6).

Latin America depends on the United States to supply the capital equipment and many manufactured and agricultural products necessary for economic stability and progress. These must be paid for in dollars, dollars that must be earned by exporting to the United States market. The coffee-producing countries earn a large part of their dollar exchange through the sale of coffee to the United States. Venezuela earns 95 percent of its foreign exchange through the sale of petroleum products, about 40 percent of which are sold to us. We could extend these figures to include the importance of sugar to the Cuban economy, copper to that of Chile, tin to Bolivia, and other similar examples.

The power to cripple the economy of another country by a tariff increase or the imposition of a quota reduction places a grave responsibility on the United States Government. On the one hand we must face the fact that, if it is important to the United States that there be economic and political stability in Latin America, we must protect her existing access to our markets. Our Government, on the other hand, is under constant pressure from our domestic producers to place competitive foreign products at a disadvantage. This is understandable.

I fully realize that our first responsibility is to our own citizens and our primary objective must be to keep our own economy strong. I realize, too, that a policy of expanding inter-American trade may affect adversely the sales of our producers of competitive products. Nevertheless, I am convinced that such a policy is clearly in the greater national interest. In the first place, these Latin American imports do not hurt our national economy. They help it. It is true that, when we let Cuba sell a ton of sugar in the United States market, it means that our own sugar producers may sell one ton less than if we had excluded that Cuban ton. But the money the Cuban exporter earns through the sale of his ton comes back to the United States and represents that much more that some United States manufacturer or farmer producing for export will sell in the Cuban market. The decrease in one United States producer's domestic sales is offset by an increase in the value of some other producer's sales for export.

The benefits of a policy of expanding inter-American trade are important to every one of us. First, that trade is worth about \$3½ billion a year to our exporters. It means a great many

thousands of jobs to our workmen. We export more to Latin America than we do to Canada or to Europe, more than to Asia and Oceania combined. Second, as I have said, it marks the difference between chaos and stability to many of our sister republics. It lends the strongest possible support to private enterprise in those countries, and it is upon private enterprise that the future of Latin America depends. Let us not forget, either, that 30 percent of those products that we buy from the other American Republics are produced by our own investors in the area.

President Eisenhower has affirmed again and again that it is the policy of this Government to encourage international trade. I believe that we can point with considerable satisfaction not only to past actions which we have taken to fulfill that policy but to actions now contemplated which would advance it even further. As you may recall, the President requested and was given authority by the past session of the Congress to negotiate with other countries for a further reciprocal reduction of tariffs and other barriers to trade. We are now making preparation within the executive branch to use that authority in negotiations that are expected to be held in Geneva beginning next January.² In accordance with our customary practice, the negotiations will be conducted within the framework of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade in which many of the Latin American countries, as well as other countries, will participate. The President has also asked that Congress at its next session approve United States membership in the Organization for Trade Cooperation,³ which is needed to assure more orderly consideration of trade problems arising between nations. Membership in such an organization would be of special importance to the United States as one of the great trading nations of the world.

Maintaining a policy of encouraging international trade is, however, far from easy. You are familiar with the strong efforts which have been made at one time or another during recent years to reduce the imports of petroleum products, whose sale in our markets is vital to the economy of Venezuela. You recall the efforts to restrict sugar imports, which are so important to Cuba, to the Dominican Republic, Haiti, and Peru. A determined effort was made to raise the tariff on

² BULLETIN of Sept. 26, 1955, p. 507.

³ *Ibid.*, Apr. 4, 1955, p. 579, and Apr. 25, 1955, p. 678.

lead and zinc, which are of basic importance to the economies of Mexico and Peru, and to impose quotas on imports of tung oil, an important export of Argentina and Paraguay. There have been a number of similar cases. Since the President's policy was announced, the executive branch and the Congress have declined to reduce the existing access that each of these vital Latin American exports has in our markets. No one can foresee what will happen in the future. One thing is certain, however. Further efforts will be made to restrict existing levels of imports from Latin America. Some may succeed. The outcome in each case will be largely controlled, as it has been in the past, by the interest that the voters of the United States show in preserving our inter-American trade.

Problems Concerning Coffee

I should like now to discuss, in the context of our trade relations with the other American Republics, some problems which may be emerging in coffee. Coffee occupies a unique position in inter-American trade. It is by far the most important commodity in our trade relations with the other American Republics. It therefore has a significance in our relations with the coffee-producing countries and in economic, social, and political conditions within those countries which is much greater than that of any other commodity.

I am always thankful when the issues can be classified as "problems" rather than "crises" and we can take time to view them objectively. There is no coffee crisis at the moment, so far as I am aware. Prices have held within the 50-60 cent price range for a number of months now. Consumption appears to be rising. The recent Brazilian frost, unfortunate as it was, has made the threat of a heavy surplus, which troubled the producing countries this spring, less serious for the current year. Consumers suspect that prices are higher than they should be, but they are buying. Producers are hoping that prices will improve, but they are selling. There are no headlines—no boycotts—no bankruptcies—and we can discuss the situation in general terms.

I want you to know that we who work in the Government realize that the coffee industry is important in the domestic economy and that the livelihood of many people depends upon it. We know that 17 million bags were imported last year

and that imports totaled almost \$1.5 billion in value. We know that roasting that quantity of coffee is big business, too—that it requires many workers and a heavy investment of capital and involves the possibility of heavy losses. We are aware of the vast distributing network of wholesalers and chainstores and small retail merchants, all of whom depend, in some degree, on coffee for their net profit. We are interested in seeing the coffee industry grow, on a sound basis, and we try to keep abreast of developments which affect it.

We are also very much aware of the importance of coffee in the economies of the producing countries. Last year 84 percent of Colombia's total exchange receipts came from coffee; 88 percent of the value of El Salvador's exports, 77 percent of Guatemala's, and 61 percent of Brazil's were accounted for by coffee alone. In such countries coffee is the barometer for the whole economy—it affects retail sales, credit, wages, and it is also the most important single factor in our foreign relations.

The State Department, like Janus in Roman mythology, must face in both directions and try to see each problem in full perspective, from the standpoint of each of the domestic interests involved and also from the standpoint of the foreign countries with which we trade.

Divergence of Domestic Interests

Often there is a divergence of interest even within the domestic industry. For example, the question of embargoing imports of soluble coffee has been under discussion recently. Some domestic interests favor it, some do not. Firms which have made a substantial investment in equipment to produce soluble coffee here at home fear that the coffee-producing countries have a natural advantage and will in time displace them unless restrictions are placed on imports of soluble coffee. They urge that such steps be taken quickly in order to forestall construction of plants abroad and minimize complaints from the producing countries that we are damaging their trade.

There are other domestic firms, however, which have an interest in developing soluble plants abroad and which are providing capital or know-how or both, and these firms would probably oppose any restrictions on imports.

Consumers also have an interest in the problem, although it is not yet fully apparent where their

interest may lie. They want to buy at the lowest price possible, assuming equivalence of quality. But until competition materializes it is difficult to know where the product can be produced most economically. This, of course, is not a problem which the Department could consider in the abstract; it has no authority to restrict imports and would be asked to take a position only if restrictive legislation should be introduced into Congress. But if that should be done, and the Department's views should be asked, it would have to consider the interests of groups outside, as well as within, the coffee industry—the interests of our export trade, for example, and the effect which such restrictions might have on our relations with the governments of the coffee-producing countries. The allegation is often made in the less developed countries that the United States is interested in them only as a source of raw materials and as a market for our finished products. Action on our part which gives support to this view has a very direct bearing on the extent to which this Government can expect those other governments to continue their cooperation with us.

Because of such broad considerations of national interest, it has been the policy of this Government, in general, to keep trade restrictions to a minimum, in the belief that an expanding foreign trade is in the best interests of the country as a whole. Our export trade is constantly threatened with the erection of tariff barriers or the imposition of quantitative restrictions by foreign countries. This is especially true in those areas of the world that are industrializing. This includes the coffee-producing countries of Latin America. To the extent that the United States follows a similar course of action, it undermines its own position in protecting its export trade.

The United States has consistently opposed the use of quantitative restrictions by other countries as a protective device against United States products and has itself, in general, followed a policy of avoiding import quotas and prohibitions for protective purposes. Provisions limiting the use of quantitative restrictions have been included in trade agreements to which the United States is a party. For example, the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, to which the United States and 34 other countries are parties, contains in article XI a general prohibition against the use of quantitative restrictions on imports or exports.

A similar problem is that relating to the con-

signment of coffee by agencies of foreign governments for sale in the United States. Some of our coffee importers are opposed to this practice. An increase in sales on government consignment would result in a parallel decline in the business of private importers. However, the importers' interest is not necessarily the same as that of the roaster, in this instance, or of the consumer. On a falling market the importer tends to hold off buying, fearing that prices may decline further and that if he maintains normal inventories he may be faced with a loss. Inventories may even fall to levels which are dangerously low from the standpoint of maintaining a normal flow of coffee through distribution channels. Foreign governments which enter coffee on consignment may help to keep inventories in the consuming country at a level which will maximize the flow of coffee into consumption.

This divergence of interest within the coffee industry was highlighted during the recent dock strike, when the Colombian Coffee Federation was able to release a considerable quantity of coffee held on consignment in New York and thus relieve a tight spot-market situation which could have caused serious inconvenience to roasters and consumers if the strike had been prolonged.

Quite aside from the possible conflict of interests within the domestic trade on this question of coffee consignments, there is a more general question which the State Department has to consider. That is the implication for our overall trade policy of undertaking to limit consignments by government entities. If individuals may ship on consignment, there would be no basis, under present international agreements, for denying state trading enterprises access to our markets on the same conditions. It would be very difficult to justify restrictive measures to the governments of coffee-producing countries on the grounds that consignment sales are detrimental to the interests of certain dealers in the United States unless it could be demonstrated that the practice affects the consumer's interest adversely, as well.

Proposed Coffee Agreement

Another chronic problem of the coffee industry is price instability. During the depression of the 1930's and throughout the last war, prices were very low and producing interests suffered. The abrupt price increases in 1950 and 1954 were re-

sented by consumers and cut into the business of dealers and distributors. We can agree, I believe, that no branch of the industry benefits from violent fluctuations in price. But when we consider how to moderate price changes, there is, again, a divergence of interests. One method which has been proposed is an international commodity agreement.

Our Government is now a party to two such agreements. However, as you know, we do not feel that our participation in them is always the best solution to the problem of price instability. Such agreements tend to introduce rigidities and restraints that impair the elasticity of economic adjustment and the freedom of individual initiative which are fundamental to economic progress. This does not mean that we minimize the importance of the problem. On the contrary, we are actively participating in a study group, under the auspices of the Organization of American States, which is making a study of the world coffee situation and of the possibilities of adopting measures of international cooperation which might reduce the range of coffee price fluctuation. As you know, some of the Latin American producing countries have been trying independently to reach accord on the framework of an international agreement among producers which would have the effect of stabilizing prices.

Most of the pressure for a coffee agreement comes, naturally enough, from the producers. A stable price is more important to them than to trader or consumer groups because of the long-term capital investment involved. If a stable price is important to the wheat farmer, who can decide each year what he will plant for the following season, it is obviously even more important to the coffee producer, who does not harvest his first crop until 4 years after he has made his initial investment in new trees and who expects to amortize that investment over a period of 25 years or more.

We undertake, on a national basis, to assure a minimum price to our producers of a number of annual crops. Of course, we cannot control the actions of other governments, but in any event, in view of our own price stabilization programs, we could not disagree in principle if the coffee-producing countries try to accomplish the same objective, as long as the actions they contemplate would not hurt consumers in this country.

Most coffee producers recognize, I believe, after the experience of the past few years, that if they

attempt to hold prices at too high a level they may lose, through a reduction in volume of sales, all that they might have gained through a higher price. They are aware, too, of the impetus which a high price is likely to give to new production, and that maintenance of such a price would accordingly be self-defeating in the long run. The United States will wish to study with great care any proposals which may be put forward on this subject and also to study carefully any alternative measures which might be taken for improving the coffee situation by such means as more effective facilities to forecast supply and demand and by a vigorous promotional program to increase consumption.

This question of a coffee agreement is typical of the problems which come up to the Government for policy decisions. I have gone into some detail in discussing the ramifications of the problems in order to emphasize the wide divergence of interests involved and the many factors which have to be considered. I know it seems to the businessman that the Washington bureaucrat takes an inordinate amount of time in coming to a decision on anything. However, as you may see, it is not always easy to determine what is in the public interest. And if at any time you men in the coffee trade have views on the subject, I can assure you that we are glad to receive them and that they will be given most careful consideration.

May I, in closing, thank you for the opportunity to appear on your program. Your invitation is another example of the continuing effort on the part of officers of your association to facilitate a reciprocal flow of information and views between the association and the government departments and agencies interested in coffee with a view to fostering an increased understanding and appreciation of mutual problems on the part of all parties concerned.

"Dual Citizens" Warned of Possible Loss of Citizenship

Press release 603 dated October 12

The State Department on October 12 warned American citizens who hold dual citizenship in another country and who have voluntarily claimed citizenship benefits of any foreign country that they are in danger of losing their American

citizenship unless they meet the requirements of the U.S. Immigration and Nationality Act before December 24, 1955.

A "dual citizen" is a person who was born in the United States of foreign parents or born abroad of American parents and who thus holds citizenship in the United States and another country at the same time.

The danger of loss of citizenship comes through failure of such a "dual citizen" living abroad in the country of which he is a dual to appear before a U.S. diplomatic or consular official to take an oath of allegiance to the United States before December 24, 1955, and to show that his reasons for such foreign residence for three years continuously after age 22 was for one of the reasons provided in the law which will exempt him from the loss of his U.S. citizenship.

These reasons are:

Is an employee of the U.S. Government.

Is receiving compensation from the U.S. Government on account of disability incurred in its service.

Is representing an American educational, scientific, philanthropic, commercial, financial, or business organization having its principal office in the United States, or a religious organization having an office and representative in the United States, or an international agency of official character in which the United States participates and from which the dual citizen receives compensation.

Is prevented from returning to the United States by ill health of himself, a parent, his spouse, or child, or by the death of a parent, spouse, or child.

Is pursuing a full course of study of a specialized character or attending full time a school above the grade of preparatory. (This exception must be limited to 5 years foreign residence.)

Is with his spouse or parent who is a U. S. citizen and who is residing abroad for one of the above reasons.

Is the spouse or child of an American citizen by birth who had his residence in the United States for at least 10 years while under the age of 21, if the citizen concerned lives abroad in order to be with such spouse or parent.

Certain categories of veterans of the Spanish-American

War or of World Wars I and II, together with their spouses, children, or dependent parents.

Those carrying on a commercial enterprise which will benefit American commerce directly or substantially in the view of the Secretary of State.

Those carrying on scientific research on behalf of an institution accredited by the Secretary of State and which is beneficial directly and substantially to the interests of the United States.

Those engaged in work under such unique circumstances as may be determined by the Secretary of State to be directly and substantially beneficial to the United States.

A dual citizen who has resided in the United States for 25 years after age 18 and who began his residence outside the United States after age 60 is not affected.

A dual national who claims a benefit of a foreign state after December 24, 1952, is given 3 years to take an oath of allegiance to the United States. Thus a person who obtained a passport, identity card, or other official document from the foreign country on January 10, 1954, would have until January 9, 1957, to take the steps necessary to preserve his American citizenship.

If a person has been coerced into seeking or claiming a benefit of the nationality of a foreign state—when forced, for example, to obtain an identity card by governmental decree having the force of law—such action is not considered voluntary. A benefit sought or claimed under the mistaken belief that the law required it, however, is not considered an involuntary act.

Most of the principal nations of the world observe the "rule of the blood," which means, for example, that a child born of a French couple in the United States is considered by France to be a French citizen. Since the United States observes both the "rule of the blood" and the "rule of the soil," this child is considered by the United States to be a citizen of the United States—in this case a dual citizen of both France and the United States.

Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy

Following is the text of a statement made by Senator John O. Pastore, U.S. representative to the General Assembly, on October 7 in Committee I (Political and Security), together with texts of a draft resolution cosponsored by the United States and of the draft statute of the proposed International Atomic Energy Agency.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR PASTORE

U.S. delegation press release 2218 dated October 7

Before beginning my formal remarks I want to say how delighted I am to be in this environment and to serve in the presence of so many distinguished representatives of the family of nations. This is a new experience for me, yet I am no stranger to the atmosphere and the objectives of the United Nations. As a United States Senator, as a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy of the United States Congress, and before then as the chief executive of my own State of Rhode Island, I have always believed that, with all of the inadequacies and deficiencies that might be attendant on an agency trusted with the solution of so many vexing and troublesome world problems, the United Nations, in this atomic age, is the one remaining hope where men of good will can meet in open forum, honestly and frankly discuss their problems, and make in good conscience the compromises which will lead to common understanding and bring peace to ourselves and to our children.

Three dates have assumed great significance for the United Nations and for mankind.

On December 8, 1953, the President of the United States, in an address before the General Assembly, pledged the United States "to help solve the fearful atomic dilemma—to devote its entire heart and mind to find the way by which the miraculous inventiveness of man shall not be dedicated to his death, but consecrated to his life."

In an effort to lead the world "out of fear and into peace," he proposed international cooperation in developing peaceful applications of the atom, particularly the establishment of an International Atomic Energy Agency.

On December 4, 1954, this Assembly unanimously adopted a resolution endorsing efforts to establish an International Atomic Energy Agency and decided to convene the international technical conference.

On August 8, 1955, this international conference was convened in Geneva.

During the period covered by these three dates, we have seen the dawn of a new era. We have hastened the day when fear of the atom will disappear and be replaced by confidence in our mastery of its immense potential for improving conditions of life for all mankind.

Already we have charted a new channel of peaceful discussion. We have embarked on a new approach to one of the most difficult problems that must be solved if, as President Eisenhower said, "the world is to shake off the inertia imposed by fear, and is to make positive progress toward peace."

Here is a great opportunity for the great powers to cooperate in a project dedicated to human aspirations.

International Conference on Peaceful Uses

The international conference, concluded so successfully at Geneva, was an important milestone in this new era. The conference was unique in several respects. It was, as noted by its President, Dr. [Homi J.] Bhabha, the eminent scientist of India, the largest conference "ever organized by the U.N." Indeed, it was probably the largest scientific conference ever held anywhere in the world.

But this was more than a scientific conference; it was an experiment in re-creating an open world.

Men of genius of many nations were brought together to exchange the fruits of more than 10 years of relatively isolated efforts. It was held in a spirit of cooperation which we hope will be as lasting in its influence as the actual exchange of scientific information that took place.

The Secretary-General, in his report,¹ has noted that there was an absence of "politics." It is somewhat unusual that an absence of politics should be significant in a scientific conference. But in the difficult era from which we are now emerging, it is significant as proof of the possibility of cooperation among all powers, great and small.

Everyone associated with the conference, from the hardworking United Nations Secretariat to the distinguished scientists of the 73 participating nations, deserves credit for its tremendous success.

Although it dealt largely with the promise of the future, the conference brought to light a number of important developments which are realities of the present. One of these is atomic-power generation. The participants had an opportunity to hear and read surveys on the world's estimated future energy requirements. They stressed the need for new sources of energy and explored the contribution that nuclear energy might make to satisfy all of these future needs. The conference put into better perspective the actual prospects for nuclear power and showed what remains to be done to realize these prospects. It made clear that, while atomic power will not cure all of the world's problems, it will become a major source of energy, particularly in areas of the world where the costs of conventional fuels are still high. In some areas of the world conventional power will continue to be more economical for many years to come, and this, of course, is especially true in my own country.

The practical utilization of atomic energy for the large-scale production of electric power requires the expenditure of large sums of money for research and development and later on for capital investment. As was made clear at the conference, the United States hopes that the initial costs can be reduced by countries sharing with one another what they have learned and developed. The United States has decided as a matter of national

policy to make the benefits of technological findings resulting from our large expenditures on nuclear energy available to the rest of the world. Thus we would help to reduce the outlays necessary on the part of other countries.

From the comments made at the conference it seems reasonable to expect that ultimately the world's supply of uranium ore will be sufficient to permit worldwide development of this tremendous force for the production of adequate power. The important role of thorium in connection with breeder reactors was also emphasized at the conference. These are heartening developments because they indicate that ultimately many countries will be in a position to exploit their own resources for the utilization of atomic energy.

Conference participants also made clear that many problems remain to be solved in connection with the peaceful applications of atomic energy. Some of these problems are administrative and legal in nature. There are also the industrial, technical, and social problems attendant upon the development of any new industry. There are problems in the field of health and safety. Complete solutions to all of these problems were not forthcoming at the conference. This was, of course, to be expected. What was remarkable, however, was the evidence that so many difficult problems have been solved during the first decade of the atomic age.

One of the most inspiring results of the conference was the proof that the development of the peaceful atom has been expedited by the scientists of so many countries. The frequent similar presentations by scientists of several different countries showed that, working separately on similar problems, they achieved similar results and, oddly enough, were vexed by similar difficulties. This, of course, is the nature of science. The conference shows that the genius of scientific discovery knows no national boundaries nor national limitations.

The information released at the conference is now in the public domain. The free flow of knowledge has been greatly stimulated.

Many reports presented at the conference described applications of the atom in medicine, biology, agriculture, and industry. The need for increased knowledge of the use of the atom to cure many of man's ills and to ease his workload was made apparent. I am confident that our doctors and scientists will develop additional applications

¹U.N. doc. A/2967 dated Sept. 14. For a report on the conference by Lewis L. Strauss, Chairman of the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, see BULLETIN of Oct. 10, 1955, p. 555.

in these fields for the greater benefit of mankind.

The United States, Soviet, and British representatives among others reported what their own countries are doing to aid others in this field. It was clear from their presentations that the countries with the most highly developed atomic energy programs cannot be satisfied with the present rate of dissemination of knowledge in this field. The fruits of their research and labors must be made available to the rest of the world with greater speed and effectiveness.

Our next task is to contribute further to establishing a sound basis for expanding the peaceful applications of atomic energy and disseminating the results to all peoples. Further cooperation in the exchange of information is essential to additional progress. As Admiral Strauss, Chairman of the United States Atomic Energy Commission, announced on August 16 in Geneva,² the United States believes that another similar conference should be convened to maintain and to insure, if possible, the momentum we attained at the Geneva conference.

That is why, as Secretary Dulles stated in his opening address on September 22,³ the United States believes that a second international technical conference should be held in 3 years, or earlier if developments in the peaceful use of atomic energy warrant. We have accordingly, in cooperation with the United Kingdom, submitted a resolution which makes such a recommendation. The United States also believes that the Secretary-General, acting upon the advice of the Advisory Committee established at the last session of the Assembly, should fix an appropriate time and date for the conference.

The International Atomic Energy Agency

A major step leading to our goal of establishing a sound basis for the peaceful utilization of the atom is the creation of an International Atomic Energy Agency. President Eisenhower placed great stress on this step in his statement to the United Nations on December 8, 1953. Last year my distinguished colleague Ambassador Lodge reported to you on our early progress toward achieving this goal.⁴ This year I am happy to say that enough progress has been made to warrant the

hope that general agreement on the statute for the agency will be reached early in 1956.

The General Assembly resolution of December 4, 1954, noted that negotiations were in progress and expressed the hope that the agency could be established without delay. Following the suggestion of the General Assembly resolution, the eight States which had been conferring on the establishment of the agency renewed their discussions. A draft statute was prepared which was generally satisfactory to all the eight States. A copy was given to the Soviet Union on July 29 of this year. We have just received on a confidential basis Soviet comments on the draft statute of the agency, and we are giving careful consideration to these suggestions.

As you all know, on August 22 copies of the draft statute were distributed by the United States, acting on behalf of the eight States, to all States Members either of the United Nations or of the specialized agencies. We are awaiting their comments or suggestions.

The statute, as its title states, is only a draft. We do not regard it as a final document in its present form. And in the same spirit that this idea was originally advanced, we welcome constructive suggestions!

In our discussions of the agency we have been motivated by the desire that an international agency shall come into being as rapidly as possible in keeping with the intent of the resolution passed unanimously by the General Assembly last December. To facilitate this objective it was obviously necessary to postpone a decision on a number of matters until after the agency had come into existence. The statute provides a broad constitutional framework which would allow for growth in any direction which might prove desirable. The one major limitation on the function of the agency is of course that it must concern itself solely and strictly with peaceful uses of the atom.

Thus we have not in the agency statute taken up such possibly controversial problems as the location of the headquarters of the proposed agency. Nor have we attempted to decide in advance the extent to which it will initially carry out all of the functions for which it is being established. Those are the types of questions which can only be decided by the members of the agency and its Board of Governors after the agency comes into being.

The General Assembly resolution of 1954 likewise transmitted "to the States participating in

² *Ibid.*, Sept. 5, 1955, p. 381.

³ *Ibid.*, Oct. 3, 1955, p. 523.

⁴ *Ibid.*, Nov. 15, 1954, p. 742.

the creation of the Agency, for their careful consideration," the record of the General Assembly discussions last year. The States engaged in these discussions have carefully considered the various suggestions which were made and, we believe, have incorporated the most important suggestions into the statute. In particular, we have provided in the draft statute for representation on the Board of Governors of the agency of States which will be primarily beneficiaries of, rather than contributors to, the agency. It is my understanding that this is the suggestion put forward last year by the representative of Pakistan and endorsed by the representative of Burma and many others.

Since the agency statute is now available to all the governments represented here, I do not think it would be appropriate to go into any further discussion of the details of the statute. The statute is of necessity rather long and complicated and most governments have not yet had sufficient time to study it and to communicate their comments to the United States. We urge every government to communicate its comments as soon as possible to the United States, which is acting on behalf of the sponsoring States. This was the procedure suggested in the notes delivered to your governments because we believe it will bring about the most rapid progress. We shall then seek to reconcile the various suggestions and incorporate as many of them as possible in a revised draft of the statute.

Because of the effort we have made to incorporate the suggestions made here last year, we have reason to hope that basic differences of viewpoint will be few and that these can be resolved by negotiation. If this should be the case, it should be possible to reach an agreed statute early in 1956.

The draft statute contains provisions to give effect to the recommendation of the General Assembly that an appropriate form of agreement with the United Nations be negotiated once the agency is established. Ambassador Lodge stated the United States position on this question on November 5, 1954:

It is our belief that a relationship should be established between the agency and the United Nations similar to that of the specialized agencies. The exact terms of the relationship must, of course, await creation of the agency itself.

The resolution which the United States cosponsored on that date⁵ recommended that such a relationship be established.

The resolution as finally adopted by the Assembly on December 4, 1954,⁶ suggested that "once the agency is established, it negotiate an appropriate form of agreement with the United Nations." The United States consented to the omission of the reference to a specialized agency type of relationship because we agreed that the resolution should not prejudice the nature of the relationship between the agency and the United Nations. However, I should like to make it clear that this did not indicate any change in our position. It is still our belief, as stated by the United States representative at the recent meeting of the Economic and Social Council,⁷ that the most appropriate form of relationship between the United Nations and the agency would be one similar to those of the specialized agencies.

The creation of the agency will, of course, not solve all our problems; it is perhaps the most important step, but only one of many steps toward our goal. Last November Ambassador Lodge stated in this committee that "there is so much to be done that it would be inconceivable for the international agency to carry on all the activities from the outset." The Geneva conference has highlighted existing accomplishments, and it revealed how much remains to be done. It is even clearer than a year ago that the program is so great that it can be achieved only through a combination of national programs, regional programs, and international programs.

United States Programs of Assistance

In recognition of this need for a combination of programs, Secretary Dulles announced last year, in his opening address to the Assembly, that the United States was prepared without delay to assist other countries in acquiring the basic knowledge and experience in this field. Among these steps was the conclusion of bilateral agreements which would make it possible for the United States under our laws to provide assistance and materials in the field of nuclear technology. In addition, Secretary Dulles outlined plans for a program of training in reactor technology, health,

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 745.

⁶ *Ibid.*, Dec. 13, 1954, p. 919.

⁷ *Ibid.*, Aug. 22, 1955, p. 324.

safety, and medicine, and the use of isotopes, as well as plans to make available unclassified technical information.

The United States has conducted extensive negotiations with representatives of foreign governments concerning agreements for cooperation in the research reactor field. Agreements concerning research reactors have already been negotiated with 24 nations. More extensive agreements for cooperation have been reached with those nations with which we have a prior relationship in the atomic energy field, namely, Belgium, Canada, and the United Kingdom.

To speed the advance of atomic knowledge and man's progress, President Eisenhower on June 11, 1955, proposed two programs which reflect the spirit and intent of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 and the desires of the American people.⁸ I quote:

First: We propose to offer research reactors to the people of free nations who can use them effectively for the acquisition of the skills and understanding essential to peaceful atomic progress. The United States, in the spirit of partnership that moves us, will contribute half the cost. We will also furnish the acquiring nation the nuclear material needed to fuel the reactor.

Second: Within prudent security considerations, we propose to make available to the peoples of such friendly nations as are prepared to invest their own funds in power reactors, access to and training in the technological processes of construction and operation for peaceful purposes.

Plans to implement these two programs are going forward rapidly.

The sole purpose of these programs is to spark man's creative and inventive skills, to pool those skills, and to put them to work for the benefit of all. As the contributions to the International Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy reveal, research reactors are invaluable tools for the acquisition of necessary reactor techniques, information, and experience and for medical research and therapy. They are indispensable in the training of personnel and valuable in the production of useful radioactive isotopes. They are basic to any long-range program for the peaceful uses of atomic energy.

Under an "Agreement for Cooperation," the United States will provide the recipient country with reactor fuel and reactor materials not readily available in the commercial market. In August

the United States Atomic Energy Commission announced a sale price of \$28 a pound for heavy water for use as a moderator and coolant in certain types of research reactors. We have already agreed to sell heavy water to Australia, France, India, and Italy. We shall make available normal uranium metal at \$40 per kilogram.

The August announcement also gave the value established for the lease of enriched uranium—\$25 per gram. The enriched uranium comes from the 200 kilograms that the United States has so far dedicated to the program for international cooperation.

Recent developments have brought us closer to the era of commercial atomic power. The brighter prospect for harnessing nuclear energy to generate electricity has given great hope to many nations of the world suffering power shortages. The realization of this hope throughout the world will be accelerated by bringing to other countries the technological information required to construct power reactors for commercial use. As part of the program announced by President Eisenhower, the United States proposes, as the power reactor plans of other countries develop, to disclose classified power reactor data—under appropriate "Agreements for Cooperation"—to nations whose economies particularly lend themselves to the development and achievement of atomic power competitive with conventionally produced power.

The laboratories of the United States are engaged in the difficult basic research required for the economic harnessing of this great power liberated by the fission of atoms. As has just been announced by the Atomic Energy Commission, they are also engaged in the basic research required to find ways to tame the great energy liberated in the fusion of the atom. Many of our great scientists are searching for the answer to this most difficult problem.

Radioisotopes are one of the readily available realities of the atomic age. Under applicable United States regulations, 51 countries are eligible to receive our radioisotopes. These regulations are being further liberalized to permit an even wider use of these isotopes in medicine, agriculture, and industry.

Our training programs are expanding rapidly. A special course in the use of radioisotopes was given to 32 foreign students from 21 countries in May of this year. Foreign students attended these

⁸ *Ibid.*, June 27, 1955, p. 1028.

courses in increasing numbers in June, July, and August. In order to meet the requests for additional training, a second special course open only to foreign scientists will begin on October 17.

In June a group of 23 distinguished physicians and surgeons from 11 countries began a 5-week tour of United States cancer hospitals and laboratories. During the tour these doctors became acquainted with the research and chemical uses of radioisotopes as well as other uses of atomic energy in the battle against cancer and other diseases. A second such tour will begin this month.

The United States has established the Oak Ridge Institute of Nuclear Studies for training in radioisotope techniques. It also has established a School of Nuclear Science and Engineering at the Argonne National Laboratory to provide advanced training in reactor technology. Graduates of these schools are trained to design and operate research reactors. At present, in addition to the 9 American students, there are 30 foreign students from 19 countries participating in the first course at the Argonne school. A second course will begin on November 7, when there will be 60 foreign students.

To date the United States Atomic Energy Commission has approved the presentation of atomic energy libraries to 26 countries. One was sent to Geneva for use by delegates to the Geneva conference and subsequently was presented to the U.N. library there. In return for a library the United States asks only that the recipient nation or institution provide the United States with copies of its own official unclassified papers in this field.

In the course of the past year we have negotiated agreements for cooperation with, presented technical libraries to, or trained students from 40 countries.⁹

These developments, together with those which other representatives here are in a position to describe, indicate that this has been a year of momentous achievement. It is, nevertheless, only a beginning. Most of us can only vaguely under-

⁹ Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Burma, Canada, Chile, Republic of China, Colombia, Cuba, Denmark, Egypt, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, India, Indonesia, Israel, Italy, Japan, Republic of Korea, Lebanon, Mexico, the Netherlands, Pakistan, Peru, the Philippines, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom, Uruguay, and Venezuela.

stand the miraculous achievement of splitting the atom. But we can easily appreciate the significance of this new tool for the eradication of disease, for making available a plentiful supply of energy to lighten man's physical burdens, and new methods for increasing food production and reducing the chronic risks of hunger and famine. Few developments in history have so stirred the imagination and aspiration of mankind.

It has been the fortunate lot of the American people and their Government to play a principal part in leading the way to the atomic era. The United States will continue to do all within its power to hasten the day when atomic energy is utilized exclusively and solely for the benefit of man.

But we humbly appreciate that this is not the task of any one nation, or any one group of nations. The task is universal, requiring the combined resources and skills of all nations working as partners toward common objectives. That is why President Eisenhower pledged the United States to cooperate in promoting international programs for the peaceful applications of atomic energy. It is in this spirit of partnership that we shall continue to share with other nations our advances in the peaceful applications of the atom.

TEXT OF DRAFT RESOLUTION¹⁰

U.N. doc. A/C.1/L. 129 dated October 6

The General Assembly,

Desiring that mankind should be enabled to make the fullest use of atomic energy for peaceful purposes;

Believing that continuing international co-operation in developing and expanding the peaceful uses of atomic energy is essential to achieve this end;

Recognizing that, in accordance with General Assembly resolution 810 (IX) of 4 December 1954, significant progress is being made in promoting international co-operation for the peaceful uses of atomic energy;

1. *Recalls* the hope expressed in resolution 810 A (IX) that the International Atomic Energy Agency will be established without delay;

2. *Notes* with satisfaction that substantial progress has been made toward negotiation of a draft statute establishing the agency and that this draft has been circulated to governments for their consideration and comment;

3. *Expresses* its satisfaction with the proceedings of the Technical Conference convened in accordance with resolution 810 B (IX), and commends the participants therein for the high scientific quality of papers and

¹⁰ Cosponsored originally by the U.S. and the U.K.; Australia and Belgium subsequently became sponsors.

discussions, and for the spirit of co-operation which prevailed at the Conference;

4. *Expresses* its appreciation of the work of the Secretary-General and the Advisory Committee in preparing and organizing the Conference;

5. *Recommends* that a second international conference for the exchange of technical information regarding the peaceful uses of atomic energy should be held under the auspices of the United Nations in about three years time;

6. *Decides* that, in order to provide for adequate advance planning for such a conference, the Advisory Committee established by resolution 810 B (IX) be continued in existence with the same terms of reference;

7. *Requests* the Secretary-General, acting upon the advice of the Advisory Committee to determine an appropriate place and date, to issue invitations to the Conference in accordance with paragraphs 3 and 7 of resolution 810 B (IX), to prepare and circulate an agenda, and to provide the necessary staff and services;

8. *Suggests* to the Secretary-General and the Advisory Committee that they consult with the appropriate specialized agencies in the course of these preparations.

DRAFT STATUTE OF INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY AGENCY¹¹

ARTICLE I

Establishment of Agency

The Parties hereto establish an International Atomic Energy Agency (hereinafter referred to as the Agency) upon the terms and conditions hereinafter set forth.

ARTICLE II

Functions of the Agency

A. The functions of the Agency shall be:

1. To encourage and assist worldwide research on and development of peaceful uses of atomic energy and to act as an intermediary for the purpose of securing the performance of services by one Member of the Agency for another.

2. To make provision, in accordance with the present Statute, for nuclear materials to meet the need for research in, and practical application of, atomic energy for peaceful purposes, including the production of electric power.

3. To foster the interchange of scientific and technical information and the development of standards in the field of peaceful uses of atomic energy.

B. In carrying out its functions, the Agency shall:

1. Conduct its activities in conformity with policies of the United Nations to further the establishment of safeguarded, worldwide disarmament and in conformity with any international agreements entered into pursuant to such policies.

2. Conduct its activities in such a manner as to assist in the development and enforcement of high standards

¹¹Text circulated by the U.S. to other members of the U.N. and specialized agencies on Aug. 22.

and practices of public health and safety in relation to fissionable and radioactive materials.

3. Allocate the resources made available to carry out the objectives of the Agency in such a manner as to secure the greatest possible general benefit in all areas of the world and be utilized in the most efficient manner possible.

ARTICLE III

Purposes

The Agency shall not concern itself with the use of atomic energy for military purposes and shall ensure, so far as it is able, that assistance granted by it or at its request is utilized solely for peaceful purposes.

ARTICLE IV

Facilities and Equipment

A. The Agency may from time to time acquire such facilities and equipment as may be necessary to carry out its authorized functions.

B. In exercising its powers under this Statute, the Agency is authorized to utilize facilities and equipment which Members may make available to the Agency within their territories.

C. When the Agency is carrying out all its authorized functions, its facilities would include among others those set forth in Article X.

ARTICLE V

Membership

A. The initial Members of the International Atomic Energy Agency shall be those States Members of the United Nations or of any of the specialized agencies which shall have signed the present Statute within ninety days after it is opened for signature and shall have deposited an instrument of ratification.

B. Other Members of the Agency shall be those States, whether or not Members of the United Nations or of any of the specialized agencies, which deposit an instrument of acceptance of the present Statute after their membership has been approved by the Board of Governors upon the recommendation of the General Conference established in Article VI. In approving a State for membership, the Board of Governors and the General Conference shall determine that the State is able and willing to carry out the obligations contained in the Charter of the United Nations and to accept the obligations as well as the privileges of membership in the Agency.

ARTICLE VI

General Conference

A. A General Conference consisting of representatives of all Members shall meet in regular annual session and in such special sessions as may be convened at the request of the Board of Governors or of a majority of Members by the General Manager provided for in Article VIII.

B. At such sessions, each Member shall be represented by one delegate who may be accompanied by alternates and by advisers. The cost of attendance of any delegation shall be borne by the Member concerned.

C. The General Conference shall elect a President and such other officers as may be required at the beginning of each session. They shall hold office for the duration of the session. The General Conference, subject to the provisions of this Statute, shall adopt its own rules of procedure. Each Member shall have one vote in the General Conference and, except as otherwise provided in the present Statute, decisions shall be adopted by a majority vote of those present and voting. A majority of Members shall constitute a quorum.

D. The functions of the General Conference shall be to:

1. Elect Members of the Board of Governors in accordance with Article VII;
2. Admit new Members in accordance with Article V;
3. Suspend a Member from the privileges and rights of membership in accordance with Article XX;
4. Consider the annual report of the Board;
5. Approve the budget of the Agency recommended by the Board in accordance with Article XVI or return it to the Board with its recommendations;
6. Approve reports to be submitted to the United Nations in accordance with any agreement between the Agency and the United Nations or return them to the Board with its recommendations;
7. Approve any agreement or agreements between the Agency and other organizations as provided in Article XVIII or return such agreements to the Board with its recommendations.

E. The General Conference shall have the authority to:

1. Make recommendations to the Board on any matter relating to the functions of the Agency; and
2. Make recommendations to the Board on any matter brought to the attention of the General Conference by the Board.

F. The regular annual session, and any special session, shall not exceed thirty days in length.

ARTICLE VII

Board of Governors

A. The Board of Governors (except the Interim Board provided for in paragraph G of Article XXI and Annex I) shall consist of sixteen members and shall be composed as follows:

1. Five shall be the Members of the Agency which are the most important contributors of technical assistance and fissionable materials as defined in paragraph A of Article X.
2. Five shall be other Members of the Agency selected from the principal producers and contributors of uranium, thorium and such other source materials as the Board may specify.
3. Six shall be other Members of the Agency elected by the General Conference with due regard to:

a. The desirability of ensuring representation of Members deriving benefits from the Agency but not making contributions referred to in paragraphs A-1, 2 and 3c of this Article;

b. Equitable geographic distribution of representation on the entire Board;

c. Contributions of services, equipment, facilities and information of assistance in fulfilling the Agency's objectives and functions.

B. Except as provided in Annex II to the present Statute, the Board of Governors shall designate:

1. For the purposes of paragraph A-1 of this Article, the five Members which are the most important contributors of technical assistance and fissionable materials.

2. For the purposes of paragraph A-2 of this Article, eight other Members which are principal producers and contributors of uranium, thorium, and such other source materials as the Board may specify. The eight Members thus designated and the five most important contributors of technical assistance and fissionable materials designated by the Board shall select five Members from the eight designated principal producers and contributors of uranium, thorium, and other source materials to serve as members of the Board.

C. A designation by the Board that a Member is qualified for selection under paragraph A-2 of this Article shall not preclude its election under paragraph A-3.

D. The designations and selection provided in paragraphs A and B of this Article shall take place not less than sixty days before each regular session of the General Conference.

E. Members represented on the Board of Governors in accordance with paragraphs A-1, 2 and 3 of this Article shall hold office from the end of the regular annual session of the conference previous to which or at which they were elected until the end of the following regular annual session of the General Conference and shall be eligible for reelection.

F. Each Member represented on the Board of Governors shall appoint one Governor to represent it together with alternates and advisers. The cost of attendance of Governors, alternates and advisers at the Board or at any committee of the Board shall be borne by the Member appointing them.

G. Each member of the Board shall have one vote and decisions shall be made by a majority of those present and voting. Two-thirds of all members of the Board shall constitute a quorum.

H. The Board of Governors shall be charged with complete authority to carry out the functions of and determine the policies of the Agency in accordance with the present Statute subject to its responsibilities to the General Conference as set forth in paragraph D of Article VI.

I. During the first year of its existence, the Board shall meet at least once every two weeks. Thereafter, the Board shall meet at such times as it may determine. The meetings shall take place at the headquarters of the Agency unless otherwise approved by the Board.

J. The Board shall elect a chairman from among its members and, subject to the provisions of the present Statute, shall adopt its own rules of procedure.

K. The Board may establish such committees as it deems advisable and may discontinue any committee

established by it. The Board may designate individuals responsible to the Board or provide for the creation of a committee or committees responsible to the Board for the purpose of establishing liaison with any other organization the work of which is related to that of the Agency. The Board may nominate persons to represent it in a joint or mixed committee with such organizations.

L. The Board shall prepare an annual report to the General Conference concerning the affairs of the Agency and any projects approved by the Agency. The Board shall also prepare for submission to the General Conference any reports which the Agency may make to the United Nations or to any other organization the work of which is related to that of the Agency. These reports along with the annual report shall be submitted to Members of the Agency at least one month before the regular annual session of the General Conference.

ARTICLE VIII

Staff

A. The staff of the Agency shall be headed by a General Manager, who shall be appointed for a fixed term by the Board. The General Manager shall be the chief administrative officer of the Agency.

B. The staff shall include such qualified scientific and technical and other personnel as may be required to fulfill the objectives of the Agency. The Agency shall be guided by the principle that its permanent staff shall be kept to a minimum and that wherever possible, the temporary services of persons possessing the requisite qualifications who are already employed in the atomic energy field shall be utilized.

C. The General Manager shall be responsible for the appointment, organization and functioning of the staff and shall be under the authority of and subject to the control of the Board. He shall perform his duties in accordance with the regulations adopted by the Board.

D. Subject to the provisions of the present Statute, the terms and conditions on which the staff shall be appointed, remunerated and dismissed shall be laid down by the Board.

E. The paramount consideration in the recruitment and employment of the staff and in the determination of the conditions of service shall be the necessity of securing the highest standards of efficiency, technical competence and integrity. Subject to this consideration, due regard shall be paid to the importance of recruiting the staff on as wide a geographical basis as possible.

F. In the performance of their duties, the General Manager and the staff shall not seek or receive instructions from any source external to the Agency. They shall refrain from any action which might reflect on their position as officials of the Agency. Each Member undertakes to respect the international character of the responsibilities of the General Manager and the staff and shall not seek to influence them in the discharge of their duties.

ARTICLE IX

Interchange of Scientific and Technical Information

A. Each Member shall make available to the Agency all data developed as a result of assistance extended by the

Agency pursuant to Article XII. It is contemplated that each Member would make available such further information as would, in the judgment of the Member, be helpful to the Agency.

B. The Agency shall collect and make available in an accessible form to Members the information within the scope of the present Statute made available to it under paragraph A of this Article.

C. The Agency shall take positive steps to encourage the exchange among its Members of information relating to the nature and peaceful uses of atomic energy and shall serve as an intermediary among its Members for this purpose.

ARTICLE X

Contributions of Materials to Agency

A. Subject to the provisions of Article XV, the Members may contribute to the Agency such quantities of fissionable materials as they deem advisable. Fissionable materials within the meaning of the present Statute shall include uranium enriched in isotope U-235, U-233, plutonium-239 and alloys and compounds of the foregoing materials and such other materials as the Board shall from time to time determine.

B. The Board shall determine from time to time such other materials and equipment and the maximum quantities thereof which the Board will accept under agreements provided in Article XV.

C. Each Member shall notify the Board of the quantities of fissionable and other materials and equipment which that Member is prepared, in conformity with its laws, to make available immediately or during a period specified by the Board.

D. The contribution of materials and equipment by any Member may be amended at any time by the Member with the approval of the Board.

E. An initial notification in accordance with paragraph C of this Article shall be made within three months of the entry into force of the present Statute with respect to the Member concerned. In the absence of a contrary decision of the Board, the initial contribution shall be for the period of the calendar year succeeding the year when the present Statute takes effect with respect to the Member concerned. Subsequent notifications shall likewise, in the absence of contrary action by the Board, cover the period of the calendar year following the notification and shall be made no later than November 1 of each year.

F. The Agency shall specify the place, method of delivery and, when appropriate, the form and composition of materials it will receive. The Agency shall also verify the stated quantities of materials received and shall report to the Members these amounts. The Agency shall be responsible for storing and protecting materials in its possession. The Board of Governors shall ensure that these materials shall be safeguarded against (a) hazards of the weather; (b) unauthorized removal or diversion; (c) damage or destruction including sabotage; and (d) forcible seizure.

G. Pending establishment of facilities by the Agency to receive the contributed materials, a Member making such

contributions shall earmark the materials which it proposed to contribute and shall keep such materials separate from other similar materials in the possession of the Member.

H. The Agency shall as soon as practicable establish or secure on the basis of minimum requirement such of the following as may be necessary:

1. Plant, equipment, and facilities for the receipt, storage, and issue of nuclear materials;
2. Physical safeguards;
3. Adequate health and safety measures;
4. Control laboratories for the analysis and verification of materials received and stored;
5. Such housing and other administrative facilities as may be necessary for any staff required for the purposes of the central pool.

I. The Agency is authorized to establish such other plant, equipment, and facilities as may be necessary to carry out in the most effective manner its functions.

J. In considering the amount and kind of materials and equipment to be made available for the purposes of the Agency, Members should be guided by the principle that the objectives of the Agency are to be furthered to the greatest possible extent.

K. The contributions made pursuant to this Article shall be utilized as determined by the Board of Governors in accordance with the provisions of this statute. No Member shall have the right to require that its contribution be kept separately by the Agency or to designate the specific project in which its contributions must be utilized.

ARTICLE XI

Available Services

A. It is contemplated that Members will make available services and facilities which may be of assistance in fulfilling the Agency's objectives and functions. The Agency shall act as an intermediary in making such services available to its Members.

B. The services may include all or any of the following:

1. Services, including consultative services, relating to the establishment and carrying on of any project regarding research into, and peaceful practical uses of atomic energy, including design of specialized equipment and nuclear reactors; and special laboratory services including the conduct of experiments and the making of tests.
2. Training and education in relation to research into or peaceful uses of atomic energy and any necessary preliminary subject.

ARTICLE XII

Agency Projects

A. Any Member or Members of the Agency desiring to set up any project in relation to research or practical use of atomic energy may request the assistance of the Agency in securing fissionable and other materials and services necessary for this purpose.

B. Any such request shall be accompanied by an ex-

planation of the purpose and extent of the project and shall be considered by the Board of Governors.

C. For the purpose of examination, the Agency shall be entitled to send into the territory of the Member making the request a person or persons qualified to investigate the projected enterprise. For this purpose the Agency in consultation with the State making the request may decide whether to utilize officials of its own staff or employ suitably qualified nationals of any Member.

D. The provisions of this Article shall also apply where appropriate to a request for services in connection with an existing project.

ARTICLE XIII

Approval of Projects

A. Before approving a project under this Article, the Agency shall take into consideration:

1. The usefulness of a project, including its scientific and technical feasibility;
2. The adequacy of plans, funds, and technical personnel to assure the effective execution and operation of the project;
3. The adequacy of proposed health and safety standards for handling and storing materials and for operating facilities;
4. The capabilities of the State making the request to secure the necessary materials and services from resources within its own territory.
5. An equitable distribution of materials and other resources available to the Agency, paying due regard to all other projects submitted to the Agency.
6. Such other matters as may appear relevant.

B. Upon approving a project, the Agency shall enter into an agreement with the State submitting the project which agreement would provide for the following:

1. The allocation to the project of the required fissionable and other materials and equipment upon such conditions as the Agency shall determine to be equitable;
2. The transfer of possession of the fissionable materials from their usual place of custody, whether the materials be in the custody of the Agency or of States earmarking the fissionable materials for use in Agency projects, to the State or States submitting the projects under conditions which ensure the safety of the shipment and meet adequate health and safety standards.
3. Continuing authority of the Agency to prescribe conditions designed to ensure and verify compliance by the State or States submitting the project with the terms under which the project was approved, as set forth in paragraph D of this Article.
4. Recommendations for services to be provided either by the Agency itself or by Members of the Agency in connection with the project, indicating the State or States best qualified to render such services. Where such services are rendered by one Member of the Agency to another, they shall be on such terms and conditions as may be arranged between the Member making the request and the Member willing to provide the service subject to the approval of the Agency.
5. Charges for materials, equipment or services to be

furnished by the Agency to the State submitting the project, as determined by the Board of Governors in accordance with Article XVI.

6. An undertaking by the State submitting the project that the assistance provided would not be used to further the development of nuclear weapons or any research directed to that end.

7. Such other provisions as may be suitable and appropriate.

C. Any agreement between the Agency and a State submitting a project under paragraph B of this Article and any agreement between a State submitting a project and a State furnishing services under paragraph B, subparagraph 4 of this Article, shall contain, to the extent relevant, provisions entitling the Agency:

1. To approve of the design and of the standards for operating conditions;

2. To require the observance of any necessary health and safety measures;

3. To require the maintenance and production of operating records to ensure accountability for fissionable materials;

4. To call for and receive progress reports including all data developed by participating States resulting from the assistance extended by the Agency, as set forth in paragraph A of Article IX.

5. To specify disposition of any fissionable materials produced or recovered, and to approve of means for chemical processing of spent fuel elements.

D. The Agency shall have authority to verify, either by on-the-spot inspection or by calling for reports, that the terms and conditions of the aforesaid agreements under which fissionable and other materials and equipment were made available have been complied with by the Member receiving them. In case of any inspection, the Agency may utilize an official of its own staff or any suitably qualified national of any Member. The Agency in its inspections shall be entitled to make its own measurements to verify reported data. In the event of a finding of non-compliance by a State, the Agency may call upon such State to remedy forthwith the violation or other infraction. In the event of failure of the violating State to comply fully within a reasonable time, the Agency may report the non-compliance to all Members and to the Security Council and General Assembly of the United Nations to the extent provided by any arrangement or agreement between the Agency, and the United Nations. In the event of such a finding by the Agency, it may also request the return of any fissionable materials supplied by the Agency and suspend the supply of any further fissionable or other materials by the Agency to the offending State. The Agency, as appropriate in accordance with Article XX, may also suspend the offending Member from the exercise of the privileges and rights of membership.

ARTICLE XIV

Standards

The Agency may propose for acceptance by Members agreements or regulations concerning the standards referred to in paragraph C of Article XIII.

ARTICLE XV

Reimbursement of Contributing Members

Unless otherwise agreed upon between the Board of Governors and the Member furnishing to the Agency materials and equipment described in paragraphs A and B of Article X, the Board of Governors shall enter into an agreement with such Member providing for reimbursement for such materials and equipment.

ARTICLE XVI

Finance

A. The Board shall submit to the General Conference the annual budget estimates for the expenses of the Agency, including expenses for the provision of any Agency facilities. To facilitate the work of the Board in this regard, the General Manager shall initially prepare the budget estimates.

B. The General Conference shall consider and approve the budget estimates and shall apportion the expenses among the Members in accordance with a scale to be fixed by the General Conference. The decisions under this paragraph shall require a two-thirds majority.

C. The reimbursement to the contributing Members provided for in Article XV shall be made from funds received by the Agency pursuant to agreements between the Agency and the Members submitting projects.

D. The Board of Governors shall establish periodically a schedule of charges for materials and services to be furnished by the Agency pursuant to agreements between the Agency and States submitting projects, including reasonable uniform storage and handling charges. This schedule shall be so designed as to produce minimum revenues adequate to provide for reimbursement to contributing Members in accordance with Article XV.

E. Funds received by the Agency pursuant to agreements between the Agency and States submitting projects shall be set aside under regulations of the Board to reimburse contributing States; any balance over and above the amounts necessary to reimburse contributing States shall be placed in the general fund.

F. The Board of Governors with the approval of the General Conference, acting by a two-thirds majority, shall have the authority to incur indebtedness on behalf of the Agency for the purpose of securing such plants, facilities and equipment as the Agency may acquire in accordance with the Statute.

ARTICLE XVII

Privileges and Immunities

A. The Agency shall enjoy in the territory of each Member such legal capacity and such privileges and immunities as may be necessary for the fulfillment of its objectives and for the exercise of its functions.

B. Delegates of Members together with their alternates and advisers, Governors appointed to the Board together with their alternates and advisers, and the General Manager and the staff of the Agency, shall enjoy such privileges and immunities as are necessary in the independent exercise of their functions in connection with the Agency.

C. Without prejudice to the immediate effectiveness of

paragraphs A and B of this Article, the legal capacity, privileges and immunities referred to in this Article shall be defined in a separate agreement between the Agency, represented for this purpose by the General Manager, acting under instructions of the Board of Governors, and the Members concerned.

ARTICLE XVIII

Relationship with other Organizations

The Board of Governors with the approval of the General Conference is authorized to enter into an agreement or agreements establishing an appropriate relationship between the Agency and the United Nations and between the Agency and any other organizations, the work of which is related to that of the Agency.

ARTICLE XIX

Amendments, Withdrawals, Disputes

A. Amendments to the present Statute may be proposed by any Member or by the Board of Governors. The text of any amendment proposed shall be communicated without delay by the General Manager to all Members.

B. Amendments shall come into force for all Members when approved by the Board of Governors and accepted by two-thirds of all the Members in accordance with their respective constitutional processes.

C. At any time after five years from the date when the Statute shall initially take effect in accordance with paragraph E of Article XXI or whenever a Member is unwilling to accept an amendment to this Statute, it may withdraw from the Agency by notice in writing to that effect given to the Board of Governors. Such notice, if communicated prior to June 30 of any year, shall take effect on December 31 of that year and, if communicated on or after July 1, shall take effect on December 31 of the next year unless the Board of Governors shall authorize an earlier date.

D. Withdrawal by a State from the Agency shall not affect its contractual obligations entered into pursuant to Article XIII.

E. The Parties to the present Statute accept the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice with respect to any dispute concerning the interpretation or application of the Statute. Any such dispute may be referred by any Party concerned to the International Court of Justice for decision unless the Parties concerned agree on some other mode of settlement. The Board of Governors is authorized to request the International Court of Justice to give an advisory opinion on any legal question arising within the scope of the Agency's activities.

ARTICLE XX

Suspension of Privileges

A Member of the Agency which is in arrears for more than two years in its financial contributions to the Agency may be suspended from the exercise of the privileges and rights of membership by the Board of Governors. A Member which has persistently violated the provisions of this Statute or of the agreements entered

into pursuant to this Statute may be suspended from the exercise of the privileges and rights of membership by the General Conference acting by a two-thirds majority upon recommendation by the Board of Governors.

ARTICLE XXI

Signature, Acceptance, and Entry into Force

A. The present Statute shall be open for signature by all States specified in paragraph A of Article V on —, 1955, and shall remain open for a period of ninety days.

B. The signatory States shall become Parties to the present Statute by deposit of an instrument of ratification.

C. Instruments of ratification and acceptance under Article V of the present Statute shall be deposited with the Government of —, hereby designated as depositary.

D. Ratification or acceptance of the present Statute shall be effected in accordance with the constitutional processes of the Parties.

E. The present Statute shall come into force when eight States have deposited instruments of ratification in accordance with paragraph B of this Article, provided that such eight States shall include at least three of the following States: Canada, France, United Kingdom, USSR, and the United States. Instruments of ratification deposited thereafter shall take effect on the date of their receipt.

F. The depositary shall promptly inform all States signatory to the present Statute of the date of each deposit of ratification and the date of entry into force of the Statute. The depositary shall promptly inform all signatories and Members of the dates on which States subsequently become Parties thereto.

G. Upon the entry of the Statute into force an Interim Board of Governors shall be established as provided in Annex I.

ARTICLE XXII

Registration with the United Nations

A. This Statute shall be registered by the depositary designated in paragraph C of Article XXI with the United Nations pursuant to Article 102 of the Charter.

B. Any agreements concluded between the Agency and any Member or Members, and between Members subject to approval of the Agency, shall be registered with the Agency and with the United Nations if the agreement is of such nature that its registration is required under Article 102 of the United Nations Charter.

ARTICLE XXIII

Authentic Texts, Certified Copies

The original text of the present Statute executed in —, — and — languages shall be deposited in the archives of the depositary Government of —. Duly certified copies thereof shall be transmitted by that Government to the Governments of the other signatories.

Annex I

Interim Board of Governors

Upon the entry of the Statute into force Members of the Agency shall each appoint one representative to act on an Interim Board of Governors until ten States including three of the following five States—Canada, France, USSR, United Kingdom, and the United States—have become parties to the Statute and for such time thereafter not exceeding sixty days as may be required to elect a Board of Governors pursuant to Article VII. This Interim Board shall be responsible for the preliminary planning of the work of the Agency, the recruitment of a General Manager and any other necessary staff on a temporary basis, and for compiling preliminary budget estimates.

Annex II

In accordance with the principles set forth in Article VII, paragraph A, the First Board of Governors shall be constituted as follows:

1. The five members of the Board under Article VII, paragraph A-1, shall be: Canada, France, USSR, United Kingdom and United States.

2. The five members of the Board under Article VII, paragraph A-2, shall be: Australia, Belgium, Czechoslovakia, Portugal and Union of South Africa.

3. Six other members of the Board shall be elected by the General Conference.

Report of Agent General of U.N. Korean Reconstruction Agency

Statement by Brooks Hays

U.S. Representative to the General Assembly¹

I should first like to thank the Agent General [Lt. Gen. John B. Coulter] of the United Nations Korean Reconstruction Agency for the informative and comprehensive reports which he has submitted to us on the work of the agency since the last General Assembly. They paint an encouraging picture of the important and growing contribution which the United Nations has been making to the rehabilitation of the Republic of Korea. The scope of this contribution is indicated by the fact that projects of every description have been launched in every province of Korea at 3,833 different locations.

The Agent General notes in his report² that UNKRA is now at the height of its operations. As

¹ Made in Committee II (Economic and Financial) on Oct. 4 (U.S. delegation press release 2214 dated Oct. 3).

² U.N. doc. A/2936.

he points out, projects which in last year's report loomed only in the future are now actually under way. This is most gratifying. The sufferings of the Korean people are being at least partly alleviated by the contributions of this very worthwhile program. Factories, mines, schools, and hospitals now benefit from UNKRA projects. The agency stands as a symbol, not only in Korea but throughout the world, of what collective action among nations can do to make life a little better, a little less burdensome for men, women, and children who have already been called upon to endure far more than human beings should.

The draft resolution on this subject, which my delegation has the honor to co-sponsor with the delegations of Australia, Belgium, Canada, New Zealand, and United Kingdom, is designed to express sentiments which, I am sure, are shared by most of us. It follows closely the lines of the resolution adopted by the General Assembly last year.

The first operative paragraph of the draft reso-

Resolution on UNKRA Report¹

U.N. doc. A/C.2/L.260 dated October 3

The General Assembly,

Recalling General Assembly resolutions 410 (V) of 1 December 1950, 701 (VII) of 11 March 1953, 725 (VIII) of 7 December 1953, and 828 (IX) of 14 December 1954,

Taking note of the report of the Agent General on the work of the United Nations Korean Reconstruction Agency for the period 1 September 1954 to 30 June 1955, and of the comments thereon by the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea (A/2982),

Recognizing the particular importance of the Agency's programme for the relief and rehabilitation of the Republic of Korea,

1. Commends the Agent General of the United Nations Korean Reconstruction Agency for the excellent progress made by the Agency in pursuing its mission of assisting the Korean people to relieve the sufferings and to repair the devastation caused by aggression;

2. Stresses the desire that the approved programmes of the Agency be expeditiously implemented to the maximum extent possible within available funds;

3. Expresses appreciation for the valuable and continuing assistance given to the Agency by United Nations specialized agencies and by voluntary non-governmental organizations.

¹ Adopted by Committee II on Oct. 5 by a vote of 48-0-9.

lution would commend the Agent General of UNKRA for the excellent progress made by the agency in the pursuit of its assigned task. It would record the General Assembly's recognition and appreciation of a task well done.

In this connection, I might say what a pleasure it was to hear of the honor paid to General Coulter and members of his staff last July by the people of Korea in a ceremony at Seoul in appreciation of what UNKRA has done for them. This was a direct and well-deserved recognition by those who are in perhaps the best position to know what the Agent General and his staff have accomplished. My Government wishes to record its appreciation of this tribute from Korea, which was paid to an important effort of the United Nations.

The second operative paragraph of the proposed resolution would express the desire of the General Assembly that the approved program of UNKRA be expeditiously completed to the maximum extent possible within available funds. We believe that UNKRA should continue as swiftly as possible to carry forward its work on those projects for which funds are available. These projects are needed by the Korean economy, and we look to UNKRA to carry them out as rapidly and effectively as possible.

We must all recognize that financial contributions to UNKRA have very nearly reached their limit. In referring to the appeals which have been made by the Negotiating Committee for Extra Budgetary Funds, the Agent General informs us that the committee has now advised the Secretary-General of the United Nations that there seems to be little prospect of raising additional substantial sums on behalf of this program. We nevertheless can be genuinely gratified that UNKRA has been able to accomplish so much on the basis of the contributions which it has received. In this connection, we would hope that outstanding pledges, which may validly be expected to materialize into contributions, should be made available as soon as possible. UNKRA should know definitely what funds it can count upon in order that it may proceed to final planning of its work.

The third operative paragraph of the resolution would express appreciation for the assistance given to this program by the specialized agencies of the United Nations and by voluntary nongovernmental organizations. We really need no reminder of the importance of this support. The cooperation among the component parts of the

United Nations system is well known, and today, more than ever before, the members of the United Nations system are working together. There is no part of this system which cannot, when the need arises, call upon some other part for assistance and receive a prompt response. The Food and Agriculture Organization, UNESCO, and UNICEF, to mention three examples, have cooperated fully with UNKRA in Korea. Through their efforts, which are described in the report before us, the UNKRA program has been more effective than it otherwise could have been.

The voluntary agencies stand behind the United Nations in almost every area of its work. Fifty-three of them are actively participating in assistance to Korean institutions. Long before the United Nations was established, or for that matter the League of Nations, voluntary agencies from many countries were operating throughout the world, inspired by religious and humanitarian motives. From these agencies have come experience, ideas, and personnel which have proved invaluable to the later organized efforts of governments.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, my delegation believes that support of this resolution will record the well-deserved approval of one of those efforts of the United Nations in which we can all take pride.

Helping Non-Self-Governing Peoples Toward Genuine Independence

Statement by Laird Bell

U.S. Representative to the General Assembly¹

Underlying the balanced words and phrases of the Report of the Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories² is a vast, groping, but powerful movement of millions of people toward an equal station in the community of free nations. This is one of the great historic movements of our time—the shift from the unequal relationships of colonialism to relationships of equality between European and non-European. The shift has, of course, by no means been completed, but it has advanced a long way in the past 10 or 12 years, and it is continuing at an ever more rapid pace. I have no doubt that it will continue

¹ Made in Committee IV (Trusteeship) on Oct. 12 (U.S. delegation press release 2225).

² U.N. doc. A/2908 and Add. 1.

until all peoples control their own social, economic, and political affairs.

The trend toward the disappearance of what is usually called Western colonialism is unmistakable and clear to all of us. I would be omitting one of the major facts of modern history, however, if I were not to mention another movement, a trend affecting many more millions of people than the shift away from Western colonialism. I refer to the vast areas of Europe and Asia where once free peoples have been deprived of their freedom. I do not propose to embark on a discussion of that movement here, but I must again say that my delegation is struck by the fact that the loss of independence by hundreds of millions of human beings receives so much less attention in the United Nations than the rate of progress of the remaining colonial peoples toward freedom.

Nevertheless, my delegation regards the progress of dependent peoples toward self-government as one of the most important questions to be considered in the United Nations. The rate of progress toward self-government of the non-self-governing peoples to whom chapter 11 of the charter applies is a key question and one in which the United Nations has a legitimate concern.

My delegation's position on the question of self-government and the rate at which it should be achieved is well known. We fully support the aspirations of *all* people to govern themselves, as our history clearly demonstrates. We do, however, want peoples to obtain the kind of self-government or independence which will be genuine and lasting. Consequently, we believe it is important that the administering powers work closely with the non-self-governing peoples to build solid educational, social, economic, and political foundations in all the remaining non-self-governing territories. The need for solid foundations should not unduly delay the process of transferring greater responsibility to the inhabitants of these territories. This process should be carried forward as rapidly as possible, but it should not, in our view, be pressed so rapidly that an emerging new nation might not be in a position to preserve its freedom. It might succumb to a form of domination far more absolute than any it had ever known before.

In addition to the question of the rate of progress toward self-government, there is another question that underlies much of the discussion in

this committee. This is the question of the role of the United Nations in furthering progress toward self-government. I shall not attempt to repeat my delegation's interpretation of chapter 11 of the charter. There is, however, one aspect of U.N. activity in this field to which my delegation attaches great importance.

Spirit of "Good Neighborliness"

My delegation firmly believes that the interests of the inhabitants of non-self-governing territories are best promoted by the United Nations when both the administering and non-administering members work together in a spirit of "good neighborliness," to use the words of article 74, to promote the objectives of chapter 11. We believe that, despite differences that arise between these groups, considerable willingness to work together has been demonstrated by both groups. We believe that the Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories has, in very considerable measure, provided a concrete example of this cooperative approach to the problems of dependent peoples. In fact, it is, in our view, one of the values of this committee that it brings together administering and non-administering members of the United Nations and provides an opportunity for the exchange of information and viewpoints in this field. The 1955 session of the committee represented, we believe, another step forward in the realization of this cooperative approach. While credit is due to all members of the committee for their contributions to this approach, my delegation joins in paying special tribute to the chairman, Mr. Scott of New Zealand, the vice-chairmen, Mr. Frazao of Brazil and Mr. Arenales of Guatemala, and the rapporteur, Mr. Jaipal of India. My delegation feels confident that the spirit that animated the Committee on Information will also pervade the work of this committee.

With regard to the specific matters discussed in the report of the Committee on Information, my delegation has, of course, already made its views known in the committee itself. We are pleased that we, along with all other members of the committee, were able to give our approval to the adoption of this report. The report is, of course, not 100 percent satisfactory to any member, but we believe that it is a reasonably balanced, useful, and constructive document, which is a real accomplish-

ment in that it reflects the willingness of members with very different viewpoints, strongly held, to accommodate themselves to the viewpoints of others. More especially, my delegation fully supports the draft resolution contained in annex 2 of the report approving the committee's report on social conditions. The agencies of my Government responsible for the administration of non-self-governing territories have, in accordance with their usual practice, already transmitted this report to the appropriate officials in the United States territories for their consideration.

We feel that the usefulness of this report was increased because of the presence of specialist advisers on the delegations of several of the administering members, and we are glad that the committee has, in the introduction to its report, taken note of the valuable assistance that it received from them. We hope that, as indigenous inhabitants become qualified specialists in the fields studied by the committee, the administering members will increasingly attach indigenous specialist advisers to their delegations. We believe that such advisers could not only enrich the work of the committee but also that their experience would be of benefit to their territories. The committee also takes note of the help it received from representatives of the non-administering members who provided information on policy and programs of which they had had experience in their own countries and which threw light on comparable problems in non-self-governing territories. This kind of real exchange of ideas and information is, we feel, one of the fields in which the committee can be of greatest value.

Like other delegates who have spoken before me, we consider the discussion of community development in the committee's report particularly useful. As the report indicates, community development programs represent an organized effort to get away from the concept of government as operating from the top down. These programs start from the practical, everyday needs of the local community, things that everyone can understand—wells, school buildings, roads. Government comes in only to provide advice, plans, equipment, and materials. The community decides what it wants and how it will get the work done. As the report points out, the results of community development programs go far beyond the wells, school buildings, roads, etc., that are built. These programs develop civic consciousness

and pride; they help the ordinary citizen to feel a part of local government and even of territorial government. It is programs animated by this spirit that provide the kind of sound foundations that are so important for successful self-government.

Future of Committee on Information

With regard to part I of the committee's report, one question, of course, dominates all others, that is, the question of whether or not the Committee on Information should be continued and, if so, under what conditions. Here, again, I believe that the position of my delegation is well known. I have already indicated several ways in which my delegation considers that the committee performs a useful function. So believing, we would like to see it continued. I have also made amply clear that in our view one of the major values of the committee is in bringing together, in a co-operative endeavor, the administering and non-administering members of the United Nations. If the committee were to be continued under circumstances where it would lose the cooperation of important members of either group, its usefulness would, to a large extent, disappear. We believe that the system of considering the problems of non-self-governing territories that has developed under chapter 11 of the charter during these first 10 years of the United Nations' existence, while not without its faults, has demonstrated that a cooperative evolutionary process in this field is possible. It was because of our serious concern over any step which might jeopardize the contribution being made by the committee toward the advancement of non-self-governing peoples that the United States representative in the Committee on Information opposed modifications in the terms of reference, tenure, and composition of the committee and that he supported the resolution contained in annex 2 of the report, which would continue the committee on the same basis for a further 3-year period. My delegation remains convinced that the adoption of this resolution by the Assembly would be in the best interests of the inhabitants of non-self-governing territories and of the United Nations itself.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, may I say that as a newcomer to this committee I am impressed by the interest in the problems of all non-self-governing peoples that is taken by practically every

member of the United Nations. It is certainly a relatively new phenomenon in the history of the world that the representatives of so many sovereign states should devote so much thought and attention to the problems of peoples that have not yet attained a full measure of self-government. I feel sure that if, despite natural differences in viewpoint, we can keep our thoughts focused on the interests of these peoples who look to us with so much hope, we will not fail to bring closer the day when they take their full part in the international community.

Current U.N. Documents: A Selected Bibliography

Security Council

Decisions Taken and Resolutions Adopted by the Security Council During the Year 1954. S/INF/9, September 13, 1955. 6 pp. mimeo.

General Assembly

Recommendations Concerning International Respect for the Right of Peoples and Nations to Self-determination. Note by the Secretary-General. A/2957, September 8, 1955. 6 pp. mimeo.

Budget Estimates for the Financial Year 1956. Revenue Producing Activities (Report by the Secretary-General). A/C.5/623, September 8, 1955. 32 pp. mimeo.

Constitutions, Electoral Laws and Other Legal Instruments Relating to Political Rights of Women. Memorandum by the Secretary-General. A/2952, September 12, 1955. 25 pp. mimeo.

Draft International Covenants on Human Rights. Observations by Governments. The Netherlands. A/2910/Add.3, September 13, 1955. 23 pp.

Question of South West Africa. Supplement to the report of the Committee on South West Africa to the General Assembly. A/2913/Add.1, September 13, 1955. 8 pp. mimeo.

The International Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy. Report of the Secretary-General. A/2967, September 14, 1955. 7 pp. mimeo.

Organization of the Tenth Regular Session of the General Assembly. Memorandum by the Secretary-General. A/BUR/140, September 14, 1955. 2 pp. mimeo.

Adoption of the Agenda and Allocation of Items to Committees. Memorandum by the Secretary-General. A/BUR/141, September 14, 1955. 14 pp. mimeo.

Draft Convention on the Nationality of Married Women. Note by the Secretary-General. A/2944, September 15, 1955. 6 pp. mimeo.

Question of Assistance to Libya. Report of the Secretary-General. A/2968, September 19, 1955. 6 pp. mimeo.

Question of Assistance to Libya. Communication dated 1 September 1955 from the Prime Minister of Libya addressed to the Secretary-General [relating to assistance received by the Government of Libya from the United Nations]. A/2969, September 19, 1955. 58 pp. mimeo.

Registration and Publication of Treaties and International Agreements. Report of the Secretary-General. A/2971, September 19, 1955. 19 pp. mimeo.

Draft International Covenants on Human Rights. Working paper prepared by the Secretary-General. A/C.3/L.460, September 20, 1955. 26 pp. mimeo.

Regulation, Limitation and Balanced Reduction of All Armed Forces and All Armaments. Conclusion of an International Convention (Treaty) on the Reduction of Armaments and the Prohibition of Atomic, Hydrogen and Other Weapons of Mass Destruction. Letter dated 22 September 1955 from the Vice-Chairman of the delegation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics addressed to the Secretary-General [transmitting texts of proposals made in the U.N. disarmament subcommittee on May 10 and at the Geneva Conference on July 21]. A/2979, September 22, 1955. 18 pp. mimeo.

Adoption of the Agenda of the Tenth Regular Session and Allocation of Items to Committees, and Organization of the Session. Report of the General Committee. A/2980, September 22, 1955. 15 pp. mimeo.

Request for the Inclusion of an Additional Item in the Agenda of the Tenth Regular Session: Item Proposed by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. Measures for the Further Relaxation of International Tension and Development of International Co-operation.

(1) Letter dated 23 September 1955 addressed to the President of the General Assembly by the Chairman of the delegation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. A/2981, September 23, 1955. 2 pp. mimeo.

(2) Letter dated 25 September 1955 addressed to the President of the General Assembly by the Chairman of the delegation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics [transmitting an explanatory memorandum on the above item]. A/2981/Add.1, September 26, 1955. 3 pp. mimeo.

Question of the Continuation of the United Nations Tribunal in Libya. Report of the Secretary-General. A/2983, September 27, 1955. 4 pp. mimeo.

Arbitral Procedure. Comments received from Governments regarding the draft convention on arbitral procedure prepared by the International Law Commission at its fifth session. Honduras. A/2899/Add. 2, September 27, 1955. 5 pp. mimeo.

Application of Spain for Admission to Membership in the United Nations. Letters dated 23 September from the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Spain addressed to the Secretary-General. A/2984, September 27, 1955. 2 pp. mimeo.

TREATY INFORMATION

Surplus Commodity Agreement With Ecuador

Press release 594 dated October 7

Acting Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs Cecil B. Lyon, and the Ambassador of Ecuador, Dr. José R. Chiriboga, on October 7 signed an agreement for the sale of surplus agricultural commodities valued at approximately \$4 million. The program for the sale of these commodities was developed pursuant to title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (Public Law 480, 83d Congress).

Payment for the agricultural commodities will

be made in Ecuadoran currency. A portion of the currency accruing under this program will be used to meet U.S. Government expenses in Ecuador. An additional part of the funds will be loaned to the Ecuadoran Government for development purposes, with eventual repayment to the United States in dollars or in strategic materials. The remainder will be used for agricultural marketing development in Ecuador and the carrying out of an educational exchange program between Ecuador and the United States.

Great Lakes Fishery Convention Enters Into Force

Press release 602 dated October 11

The Convention on Great Lakes Fisheries entered into force on October 11 upon the exchange of ratifications in Ottawa by the United States and Canada. The convention was signed at Washington on September 10, 1954.¹

The convention brings under a joint U.S.-Canada conservation regime the greatest fresh-water fisheries in the world. Under it will be established the Great Lakes Fishery Commission, composed of six Commissioners, three from each Government. The Commission will seek the preservation and improvement of the Lakes fisheries through dual activities in the fields of fishery research and sea lamprey control.

In fishery research, the Commission has the duty of coordinating the scientific activities of all agencies presently engaged in scientific study of the Lakes fisheries—the United States and Canadian Governments and the conservation departments of the eight Great Lakes States and the Province of Ontario. The convention thus provides a machinery for the pooling of the efforts of all fishery experts in the area and the coordination of their research.

The Commission will have no power to regulate fishing operations. It can, however, recommend conservation measures to the party Governments on the basis of its scientific findings.

The second major responsibility of the Commission is to destroy the parasitic sea lamprey. This eel-like creature attaches itself like a leech

to a fish and nourishes itself on the blood and body juices of its host. It has proved a scourge to the trout and whitefish of the upper Lakes, having already destroyed those species in Lakes Huron and Michigan. Lake Superior fisheries are now also under serious attack. It is estimated that this parasite is costing Great Lakes fishermen more than \$5 million a year in lake trout alone.

The Commission has wide powers in the field control of the lamprey. It is expected the Commission will make extensive use of electrical barriers which, placed across spawning streams, prevent the lampreys from going upstream to spawn and cause their deaths.

Current Actions

MULTILATERAL

Commerce

International convention to facilitate the importation of commercial samples and advertising material. Dated at Geneva November 7, 1952.¹

Accession deposited: Egypt, September 29, 1955.

Safety at Sea

Convention on safety of life at sea. Signed at London June 10, 1948. Entered into force November 19, 1952. TIAS 2495.

Notification by Netherlands of extension to: Netherlands Antilles, January 11, 1955.

Telecommunications

International telecommunication convention. Signed at Buenos Aires December 22, 1952. Entered into force January 1, 1954.

Notification by Italy of application to: Somaliland, September 9, 1955.

Ratification deposited: Spain, the Zone of Spanish Protectorate in Morocco, and Spanish Possessions, September 16, 1955.

Final protocol to the international telecommunication convention. Signed at Buenos Aires December 22, 1952. Entered into force January 1, 1954.

Ratification deposited: Spain, the Zone of Spanish Protectorate in Morocco, and Spanish Possessions, September 16, 1955.

Additional protocols to the international telecommunication convention. Signed at Buenos Aires December 22, 1952. Entered into force December 22, 1952.

Ratification deposited: Spain, the Zone of Spanish Protectorate in Morocco, and Spanish Possessions, September 16, 1955.

BILATERAL

Austria

Agreement concerning the disposition of certain United States property in Austria, with appendix. Signed at Vienna September 26, 1955. Entered into force September 26, 1955.

¹ Not in force.

¹ BULLETIN of Sept. 27, 1954, p. 465.

Canada

Convention on Great Lakes fisheries. Signed at Washington September 10, 1954.

Ratifications exchanged: October 11, 1955.

Entered into force: October 11, 1955.

Colombia

Agreement providing for performance by members of Army, Navy, and Air Force missions of certain duties specified in article V of military assistance agreement of April 17, 1952 (TIAS 2496). Effected by exchange of notes at Bogotá July 13 and September 16, 1955. Entered into force September 16, 1955.

Ecuador

Agricultural commodities agreement under title I of Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 454, 455). Signed at Washington October 7, 1955. Entered into force October 7, 1955.

Luxembourg

Agreement relating to the off-shore procurement program. Signed at Luxembourg April 17, 1954.

Entered into force: September 30, 1955 (date of notification to the United States of ratification by Luxembourg).

Agreement approving the off-shore procurement contract with Luxembourg. Effected by exchange of notes, with contract attached, at Luxembourg April 17, 1954.

Entered in force: September 30, 1955 (date of entry into force of the off-shore procurement program agreement).

Agreement amending the agreement of April 17, 1954, relating to the off-shore procurement contract. Effected by exchange of notes at Luxembourg May 10 and July 16, 1954.

Entered into force: September 30, 1955 (date of entry into force of the off-shore procurement program agreement).

Pakistan

Agreement relating to sale of certain surplus agricultural commodities and providing for use of proceeds for urgent relief requirements of Pakistan, pursuant to agreement for additional emergency assistance in agricultural commodities of January 18, 1955 (TIAS 3188). Signed at Karachi September 29, 1955. Entered into force September 29, 1955.

THE DEPARTMENT

Recess Appointments

Herbert V. Prochnow as Deputy Under Secretary for Economic Affairs, October 4.

Designations

Roderic L. O'Connor as Deputy Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations, effective December 1 (press release 591 dated October 5).

THE FOREIGN SERVICE

Recess Appointments

John D. Hickerson as Ambassador to Finland, October 4.
Thomas C. Mann as Ambassador to El Salvador, October 11 (press release 604 dated October 12).

PUBLICATIONS

Recent Releases

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C. Address requests direct to the Superintendent of Documents, except in the case of free publications, which may be obtained from the Department of State.

International Rice Commission. TIAS 3046. Pub. 5657. 27 pp. 15¢.

Amended constitution, with rules of procedure, adopted by the United States and other governments. Approved by a resolution adopted December 10, 1953, by the Seventh Session of the Conference of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, held at Rome November 23-December 11, 1953. Entered into force December 10, 1953.

Enlistment of Philippine Citizens in the United States Navy. TIAS 3047. Pub. 5660. 3 pp. 5¢.

Agreement between the United States and the Republic of the Philippines—amending agreement of November 18 and December 13, 1952. Exchanges of notes—Dated at Manila April 1, June 21, and July 20 and 30, 1954. Entered into force June 21, 1954.

Special Economic Assistance. TIAS 3051. Pub. 5664. 6 pp. 5¢.

Agreement between the United States and Jordan. Exchange of notes—Signed at Amman May 4 and 13, 1954. Entered into force May 13, 1954.

Enlistment of Philippine Citizens in the United States Navy. TIAS 3067. Pub. 5690. 3 pp. 5¢.

Agreement between the United States and the Republic of the Philippines—amending agreement of November 18 and December 13, 1952, as amended. Exchange of notes—Signed at Manila September 2, 1954. Entered into force September 2, 1954.

Mexican Agricultural Workers, Non-occupational Insurance. TIAS 3127. Pub. 5783. 5 pp. 5¢.

Agreement between the United States and Mexico. Exchange of notes—Dated at México November 19, 1954. Entered into force November 19, 1954.

American Principles. "Confident of Our Future" (Dulles)	639
American Republics. The Importance of Trade in Inter-American Relations (Holland)	654
Atomic Energy. Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy (Pastore statement and texts of draft resolution and draft statute of International Atomic Energy Agency)	660
Canada. Great Lakes Fishery Convention Enters Into Force	677
Disarmament. President and Soviet Premier Exchange Views on Inspection (texts of letters)	643
Economic Affairs	
Great Lakes Fishery Convention Enters Into Force	677
The Importance of Trade in Inter-American Relations (Holland)	654
Surplus Commodity Agreement With Ecuador	676
U.S. Establishes Mission to Coal and Steel Community	643
Ecuador. Surplus Commodity Agreement With Ecuador	676
Europe. U.S. Establishes Mission to Coal and Steel Community	643
Foreign Service	
Recess Appointments (Hickerson, Mann)	678
U.S. Establishes Mission to Coal and Steel Community	643
Iran. U.S. Welcomes Iran's Adherence to "Northern Tier" Pact	653
Korea. Report of Agent General of U.N. Korean Reconstruction Agency (Hays statement and text of resolution)	672
Mutual Security. Progress in the Rule of Law (Phleger)	647
Non-Self-Governing Territories. Helping Non-Self-Governing Peoples Toward Genuine Independence (Bell)	673
Portugal. Visit of Foreign Minister of Portugal	653
Presidential Documents. President and Soviet Premier Exchange Views on Inspection (texts of letters)	643
Protection of Nationals and Property. "Dual Citizens" Warned of Possible Loss of Citizenship	658
Publications	
Current U.N. Documents	676
Recent Releases	678
State, Department of	
Designations (O'Connor)	678
Recess Appointments (Prochnow)	678
Treaty Information	
Current Actions	677
Great Lakes Fishery Convention Enters Into Force	677
Surplus Commodity Agreement With Ecuador	676
U.S.S.R.	
"Confident of Our Future" (Dulles)	639
President and Soviet Premier Exchange Views on Inspection (texts of letters)	643

United Kingdom. Washington Old Hall, Symbol of British-American Kinship (Aldrich)	651
United Nations	
Current Documents	676
Helping Non-Self-Governing Peoples Toward Genuine Independence (Bell)	673
Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy (Pastore statement and texts of draft resolution and draft statute of International Atomic Energy Agency)	660
Report of Agent General of U.N. Korean Reconstruction Agency (Hays statement and text of resolution)	672

Name Index

Aldrich, Winthrop W	651
Bell, Laird	673
Bulganan, Nikolai A	644
Butterworth, W. Walton	643
Cunha, Paulo	653
Dulles, Secretary	639
Eisenhower, President	643
Hays, Brooks	672
Hickerson, John D	678
Holland, Henry F	654
Mann, Thomas C	678
O'Connor, Roderic L	678
Pastore, John O.	660
Phleger, Herman	647
Prochnow, Herbert V	678

Check List of Department of State

Press Releases: October 10-16

Releases may be obtained from the News Division, Department of State, Washington 25, D. C.

Press releases issued prior to October 10 which appear in this issue of the BULLETIN are Nos. 591 of October 5, 593 of October 6, 594 of October 7, and 596 of October 8.

No.	Date	Subject
597	10/10	Dulles: "Confident of Our Future."
598	10/10	Visit of Portuguese Foreign Minister.
599	10/10	U.S. mission to Coal and Steel Community.
*600	10/10	Educational exchange.
*601	10/11	Holland: aspects of inter-American system.
602	10/11	Great Lakes fishery convention in force.
603	10/12	Warning to "dual citizens."
604	10/12	Mann appointment (rewrite).
605	10/12	Iran's adherence to Baghdad pact.

*Not printed.



the
Department
of
State

UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
DIVISION OF PUBLIC DOCUMENTS
WASHINGTON 25, D. C.
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

PENALTY FOR PRIVATE USE TO AVOID
PAYMENT OF POSTAGE, \$300
(GPO)

THE AMERICAN CONSUL

Publication 5893

10 cents

Many American tourists have but vague ideas of what they should expect from their consuls in the way of services while they are traveling abroad. The average United States citizen has some idea of the functions of his diplomatic representatives but seems to be quite confused about the duties of the American consul.

The American Consul, a 14-page pamphlet, tells what a consul is and what he does. The leaflet offers a concise account of the history and development of the consular services. These are some of the subjects treated:

Some Early History
Ships and Seamen
Visas
Passports
Citizenship
Protective Services
Custody of Estates
Insuring Just Treatment
Missing Persons
Consular Courts
Political, Economic, and Trade Reports

Copies of *The American Consul* may be purchased for 10 cents from the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C.

Order Form

To: Supt. of Documents
Govt. Printing Office
Washington 25, D.C.

Enclosed find:

\$ _____
(cash, check, or
money order).

Please send me _____ copies of *The American Consul*.

Name: _____

Street Address: _____

City, Zone, and State: _____

TO AVOID
900

4

8